

Exhibit 1

FIRST REPORT – Part 1

of

Dr. Jon A. Krosnick
Stanford University
432 McClatchy Hall
450 Serra Street
Stanford, California 94305

on

August 13, 2019

Scott Weaver, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, Plaintiff, v. Champion Petfoods USA, Inc. and Champion Petfoods LP, Defendants. United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, Case No. 2:18-cv-01996-JPS.

I. **Introduction and Background of Opinion**

1. I am the Frederic O. Glover Professor of Humanities and Social Sciences and a Professor of Communication, Political Science, and (by courtesy) Psychology at Stanford University in Stanford, California, a Research Psychologist at the U.S. Census Bureau, and a Research Advisor of the Gallup Organization.

2. I have written this report to offer an opinion about how providing information about Champion dog foods to supplement information on packages affects consumers' perceptions of the quality of the product and the economic value of the products to consumers.

3. A recent full curriculum vitae is attached to this declaration as Appendix A. In paragraphs 4-9 below, I summarize some important aspects of my qualifications and background.

4. I received an A.B. degree in psychology from Harvard University and M.A. and Ph.D. degrees in social psychology from the University of Michigan. As a part of my undergraduate and graduate studies, I received extensive training in social psychology, survey and experimental research techniques, statistical data analysis, and political science.

5. From 1986 to 2004, I was a member of the faculties in Psychology and Political Science at The Ohio State University. My position there involved teaching classroom courses for undergraduates and graduate students, as well as one-on-one training of graduate students in research methods. Since 2004, I have done similar work at Stanford University.

6. My research has been recognized by the Erik H. Erikson Early Career Award, by election as a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, by election as a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, by two fellowships at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, and by election as a Fellow by the American Psychological Association, the American Psychological Society, and the Society for Personality

and Social Psychology. I was awarded the Nevitt Sanford Award from the International Society of Political Psychology. And I was awarded the lifetime career achievement award from the American Association for Public Opinion Research, the world's leading professional organization of survey researchers.

7. I have authored or co-authored seven published books and two forthcoming, more than 160 articles published or in press in journals or edited books, over 250 research presentations at professional conferences, and more than 250 invited addresses at universities and to government agencies, businesses, and in other settings. My journal articles have been selected by editors for reprinting in edited books more than 15 times. My journal articles have appeared in top-ranked journals in social psychology (Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Journal of Experimental Social Psychology), political science (American Political Science Review, American Journal of Political Science), survey research methods (Public Opinion Quarterly), and sociology (American Sociological Review, American Journal of Sociology).

8. Much of my research has focused on survey research methods, including how best to measure behavior and opinions through surveys, and almost all of my research has involved collection and analysis of survey data.

9. There are several other indicators of my competence as an expert on social science research methods. First, I have served on the editorial board of the most prestigious journals in social psychology (Journal of Personality and Social Psychology) and in survey research methods (Public Opinion Quarterly). Second, I regularly serve as a reviewer for other journals, publishers, and professional organizations. Third, I have received more than 100 grants to support my research. Fourth, I have served on the Board of Overseers of the General Social Survey and was co-Principal Investigator of the American National Election Studies, which are

the nation's leading academic survey research projects studying the public's opinions and behaviors. Fifth, I have been teaching research methodology since the early 1980s and have been invited to give lectures and teach courses on research methodology to the research staffs of federal agencies in Washington, D.C., and at many professional organizations and universities around the U.S., as well as in the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, South Africa, Canada, and elsewhere.

10. To complete my assignment in this case, I reviewed case-specific documents supplied to me by Plaintiffs' counsel, including:

- The Third Amended Class Action Complaint
- Champion Declaration re Class Cert- WI case.pdf
- Champion Milam Declaration re Class Cert- Wi Case.pdf
- Champion Rebuttal Expert Report- WI case.pdf
- Code of Federal Regs.pdf
- CPF0001136.pdf
- CPF0057656.pdf
- CPF1973651.pdf
- CPF2070652.pdf
- CPF2117026.pdf
- CPF2117031-CPF2117039.pdf
- CPF2117040-CPF2117048.pdf
- D Colo – Jerding and Renfro v. Champion.pdf
- D Iowa – Blackburn v. Champion.pdf
- D Mass – Slawsby v. Champion.pdf
- D Minn – Song and Wertkin v. Champion.pdf
- Damages Expert Rpt.- WI case.pdf
- DM-#534873-v8-Second_Amended-Complain_-
_Illinois_Champion_Dog_Food.pdf
- Label Expert Rpt.- WI case.pdf;
- Dog Food Testing.pdf
- ED Mich – Shaker v. Champion.pdf
- ED Wis – Weaver v Champion (redacted).pdf
- ND Ill – Zarinebaf and Chernik v. Champion.pdf
- NDNY – Colangelo v. Champion.pdf
- WD Wash – Rydman v. Champion.pdf
- Numerous Champion marketing materials and internal reports

11. I also drew upon my pre-existing knowledge of the literatures on survey research methods and related fields. I oversaw the design and conduct of an experiment embedded in a survey conducted with a nationally representative sample of American adults.

12. Based upon my prior experience and my work done on this matter, I have reached the conclusion, based on a survey that I conducted, that providing corrective information to consumers about alleged contaminants in Champion dog foods and providing corrective information about local sourcing, use of fresh ingredients, and participation of third parties in manufacturing decreased the apparent quality and healthiness of Champion dog foods and decreased the economic value of the dog foods to consumers by specific, measurable amounts. I outline the details of all this below.

13. My comments below are organized in the following manner. I begin by explaining the logic and theory underlying survey research methods and the principles that justify generalizing from a systematically selected sample of people to the full population from which they are drawn. Then I review the uses of surveys in court and the valuable roles that surveys can play in litigation generally and in this case in particular. Next, I review the procedures that I implemented to conduct a survey in this case, and I describe the results of that survey. Details of the methodology and results of the survey that I conducted are provided in the Technical Report in this document.

Survey Research Methods

14. Survey research is a well-established and solidly respected scientific approach to measuring the behavior, attitudes, and beliefs of populations of individuals (Babbie, E.R. 1990. Survey Research Methods. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth; Weisberg, H, Krosnick, J. A., & Bowen, B. 1996. An Introduction to Survey Research, Polling, and Data Analysis. Thousand Oaks, CA:

Sage). Conducting a survey research study involves three principal phases: (1) drawing a sample of respondents to represent a population, (2) collecting data from those respondents, and (3) analyzing the data generated to answer the questions of interest. Surveys are usually done for one or both of two reasons: (1) to document the prevalence of some characteristic in a population, and/or (2) to document causal processes that produce behaviors, beliefs, or attitudes.

15. Survey research dates back at least to the 19th century, but the most significant developments and improvements in the method took place during the first half of the 20th century. During that time, researchers came to recognize that the method by which respondents are selected from a population can introduce substantial error to measurements if done improperly. Therefore, research on survey sampling has burgeoned during the last fifty years, and the result of this work is an excellent understanding of effective methods for drawing representative samples of populations. And the centerpiece of high quality, scientific survey research is random selection.

16. Although the word “random” has taken on the meaning “non-systematic” or “arbitrary” in contemporary informal, everyday conversations, the technical, scientific meaning of this term is anything but arbitrary. “Random” has a very specific, technical, and non-arbitrary definition in science, and randomization is one of the most valuable scientific tools, because it allows researchers to reach two sorts of conclusions. In one of its forms, random selection from a population is accomplished by using a method to select a subset of the population such that each member of the population has a known, non-zero probability of being chosen. For example, this can be done by flipping an unbiased coin over and over again, with each observation of heads or tails determining whether the next person on a list of population members should be chosen for study or omitted.

17. Randomization has also been employed in thousands of scientific experiments. Consider, for example, randomized clinical trials in which a researcher wishes to determine whether a drug helps people suffering from an affliction. In particular, consider a researcher who wishes to learn whether an analgesic reduces pain from headaches. The researcher could give the drug to a group of people who report often suffering from headaches and, a month later, could ask those people whether their headache pain has been less than it was before they were given the drug. But if the month began at the beginning of April, and many of the headaches people experienced during that time were due to allergic reactions to pollen released by newly-blooming plants and flowers at the beginning of April, then people may report less pain not as the result of taking the drug but instead because of the disappearance of the stimulating pollen mid-month.

18. To avoid this artifact, the researcher can compare reports of headache pain from a group of people given the drug with reports of headache pain from a group of people not given the drug. But imagine that the researcher collected data from the first group of people by giving them the drug at the beginning of April and measuring headache pain at the end of April, and the researcher collected data from people not given the drug by asking about their headache pain during the month of May. Again, the difference between these two groups could be because less pollen in May caused headaches then to be less painful.

19. This ambiguity can be eliminated by random assignment. This randomization would again be done using a truly random device. Let us assume that flipping a coin is a truly random process, meaning that each time the coin is flipped, there is a 50% chance that it will fall with the heads side up, and a 50% chance that it will fall with the tails side up, and that the result of any given coin flip cannot be predicted in any way. If we begin with a group of people who agree to participate in an experiment on analgesics and flip a coin for each of those people, we can

separate them into two groups (one whose coins land heads up, and the other whose coins land tails up) that are essentially identical to one another in every regard: the percent of men, the percent of women, the percent of old people, the percent of young people, the percent who have graduated from college, the percent with red hair, and on and on. Every attribute will be present in almost exactly the same amount in the two groups.

20. If one of those groups is then given the analgesic to use when experiencing headaches in April, and the other group is not given the analgesic to use during the same time period, the difference between the two groups in their reports of headache pain will be attributable to the impact of the drug (if a statistical test indicates that that difference had a small probability of occurring by chance alone). This reasoning is only possible because participants were randomly assigned to the two groups. Randomization in this sense eliminates all artifacts.

21. But imagine that the people who participated in the experiment on headache pain were all 18-year-old men. Do the results of the study apply to 18-year-old women as well? Or to older men and women? There is no way to know, so a researcher who studies only 18-year-old men has no legitimate scientific basis to claim that the obtained study results show that the drug helps adults generally. Fortunately, randomization can be used in a second way to eliminate this ambiguity. The participants in a study can be randomly selected from the population of interest, and the results can then legitimately be viewed as descriptive of the population.

22. This can again be accomplished using a randomizing device. In the Netherlands, for example, the government maintains a “register” listing every person living in that country, and the register can be used by researchers to select a random sample of the population. You can imagine this process being done using a randomizing device such as the coin I described earlier. Imagine that for each person in the register, a researcher flips a coin, removes individuals from

the list whose coin lands with heads facing up, and retains individuals whose coin lands with tails facing up. After this has been done once, about half of the people in the register will remain. If the same coin flipping procedure is implemented again among the retained individuals, about one quarter of the original register will remain. And this can be done over and over in order to obtain a random sample of a relatively small size (say 1,000 people out of a population of millions). This is called “simple random sampling.”

23. If random sampling from the population is not implemented, there is no scientific basis to justify generalizing the results of a study from a group of participants to any larger population of people. According to William Barber (Barber, W. G., 2011. The universe. In Diamond S. S., & Swann, J. B. 2011. Trademark and deceptive advertising surveys: Law, science, and design. Chicago, IL: American Bar Association), random sampling “produces the most statistically reliable results” (p. 47).

24. If simple random sampling is done, statistical principles permit precise documentation of the uncertainty associated with the sample in generalizing to the population due to what is called “sampling error.” For example, if a researcher is interested in gauging the percentage of a company's employees who smoked five or more cigarettes each day during January, 2000, he or she could draw a simple random sample of size N from the population of all employees and interview each interviewed sample member, asking whether he or she smoked five or more cigarettes each day during January, 2000.

25. Imagine that a proportion p (somewhere between 0% and 100%) of the respondents report having done so. If the only error in this measurement is due to simple random sampling error, and if the study were to be repeated exactly the same way 100 times, in 95 percent of those

times, the observed proportion of smokers would be within the “confidence interval” around the observed proportion p , that is between $(p-SE)$ and $(p+SE)$, where:

$$SE = \pm 1.96\sqrt{p(1-p)/(N-1)}$$

As the size of the sample approaches the size of the total population, SE gets a bit smaller than the formula above suggests. But most survey samples are much smaller than their relevant populations, so the formula offered above accurately describes the sampling error involved.

26. For example, if 38% of 1,000 survey respondents said that their favorite color was blue, the sampling error of that proportion is:

$$SE = \pm 1.96\sqrt{.38(1-.38)/(1,000-1)}$$

27. This means that if the study were repeated 100 times, in 95 of them, the observed proportion of people saying blue was their favorite color would fall between 35% (38% - 3%) and 41% (38% + 3%). This is based on the fact that the sample of 1,000 respondents was selected by simple random sampling. It is also possible to compute confidence intervals differently if more complex approaches to random sampling are implemented.

28. The response rate for a survey is the proportion of members of the selected sample from whom data are in fact collected. In almost all surveys, the response rate is less than 100%. A low response rate does not guarantee the presence of non-response bias. It is possible to conduct a survey with a response rate of 20% and end up with data from the participating sample that closely mirrors the population.

29. An accumulating number of publications show that as long as a representative sample is scientifically drawn from the population and thorough, professional efforts are made to collect data from all selected potential respondents, variation in response rates is generally not associated with notable changes in the accuracy of the survey’s results (Curtin, R., Presser, S., &

Singer, E. 2000. The effects of response rate changes on the index of consumer sentiment. Public Opinion Quarterly, 64, 413-428; Holbrook, A. L., Krosnick, J. A., & Pfent, A. M., 2008. The causes and consequences of response rates in surveys by the news media and government contractor survey research firms. In J. M. Lepkowski, C. Tucker, J. M. Brick, E. D. de Leeuw, L. Japen, P. J. Lavrakas, M. W. Link, & R. L. Sangster (Eds.), Advances in Telephone Survey Methodology. New York: Wiley; Keeter, S., Miller, C., Kohut, A., Groves, R. M., & Presser, S. 2000. Consequences of reducing nonresponse in a national telephone survey. Public Opinion Quarterly, 64, 125-148; Merkle, D., & Edelman, M. 2002. Nonresponse in exit polls: A comprehensive analysis. In R. M. Groves, D. A. Dillman, J. L. Eltinge, & R. J. A. Little (Eds.), Survey Nonresponse, pp. 243–58. New York: Wiley).

30. A key factor that determines the accuracy of a survey is its questionnaire. Survey research is premised upon the notion that all respondents should be asked the same questions in the same way. The wordings of questions are typically specified through an extensive design process. Questions are drafted based upon a set of principles that seek to achieve comprehensibility, uniform understanding across respondents, and the absence of forces biasing respondents toward any given answer. A huge literature of thousands of scientific studies now exists identifying these principles and guiding researchers in how best to word questions to achieve these goals.

31. Survey research findings are used widely by government agencies, businesses, and in academic research. For example, whereas survey data appeared in articles in top journals in political science, economics, social psychology, and sociology in 1949 at a rate of 3%, 6%, 22%, and 24%, respectively, these figures increased by 1994 to 42%, 42%, 50%, and 70%, respectively (Presser, S. 1984. The use of survey data in basic research in the social sciences. In

C. F. Turner and E. Martin (Eds.), Surveying Subjective Phenomena. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; Saris, W. E., Gallhofer, I., van der Veld, W., & Corten, I. 2003. A Scientific Method for Questionnaire Design: SQP. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam).

32. Decades of research have shown that the reliability and validity of survey data collected optimally are generally quite high, and that respondents can be relied upon to provide quite accurate descriptions of their past experiences, behaviors, and opinions. Most visibly, scientific surveys conducted according to best practices just before U.S. presidential elections predict post-election government reports of the actual election voting results very closely (see, e.g., Visser, P. S., Krosnick, J. A., Marquette, J., & Curtin, M. 1996. Mail surveys for election forecasting? An evaluation of the Columbus Dispatch poll. Public Opinion Quarterly, 60, 181-227; Visser, P. S., Krosnick, J. A., Marquette, J., & Curtin, M. 2000. Improving election forecasting: Allocation of undecided respondents, identification of likely voters, and response order effects. In P. Lavrakas & M. Traugott (Eds.), Election Polls, the News Media, and Democracy. New York, NY: Chatham House). For example, for decades beginning in 1936, the percent of votes won by the winner has correlated with the Gallup Poll's pre-election prediction of that percentage .85, a nearly perfect association.¹ Likewise, for decades beginning in 1948, the American National Election Study surveys' post-election measurements of the proportions of votes won by the winning presidential candidate have correlated with official government vote counts .92, again nearly perfect.

33. A high level of accuracy can be achieved if a survey is conducted using optimal procedures, including drawing a representative sample of the population, taking extensive steps

¹ Correlations can range from 1 (meaning a perfect match between the variables) to 0 (meaning a relation between the variables no better than chance) to -1 (meaning a perfect inverse relation between the variables).

to collect data from as many sampled people as possible, optimizing the choice of survey mode to achieve accurate measurements, asking questions that are easily comprehensible and do not entail biased wording or format, weighting results to correct for unequal sampling probabilities and unequal non-response, and much more.

Uses of Surveys in Court

34. Surveys have been admitted routinely in court as evidence suitable for use by an expert to form an opinion. Diamond (2000) provided a history of the uses of surveys in court in her chapter, Reference Guide on Survey Research (2nd edition). In Reference Manual on Scientific Evidence. Washington, D.C.: Federal Judicial Center, 229-276), she wrote:

“Forty years ago, the question whether surveys constituted acceptable evidence still was unsettled. Early doubts about the admissibility of surveys centered on their use of sampling techniques and their status as hearsay evidence. Federal Rule of Evidence 703 settled both matters for survey by redirecting attention to the “validity of the techniques employed.” The inquiry under Rule 703 focuses on whether facts or data are “of a type reasonably relied upon by experts in the particular field in forming opinions or inferences upon the subject.” For a survey, the question becomes, “Was the poll or survey conducted in accordance with generally accepted survey principles, and were the results used in a statistically correct way?”

“Because the survey method provides an economical and systematic way to gather information about a large number of individuals or social units, surveys are used widely in business, government, and, increasingly, administrative settings and judicial proceedings. Both federal and state courts have accepted survey evidence on a variety of issues. ... Surveys of employees or prospective employees are used to support or refute

claims of employment discrimination. ...Requests for a change of venue on grounds of jury pool bias often are backed by evidence from a survey of jury-eligible respondents in the area of the original venue. ... A routine use of surveys in federal courts occurs in Lanham Act cases, where the plaintiff alleges trademark infringement or claims that false advertising has confused or deceived consumers. The pivotal legal question in such cases virtually demands survey research because it centers on consumer perception (i.e., is the consumer likely to be confused about the source of a product, or does the advertisement imply an inaccurate message?). In addition, survey methodology has been used creatively to assist federal courts in managing mass torts litigation. Faced with the prospect of conducting discovery concerning 10,000 plaintiffs, the plaintiffs and defendants in *Wilhoite v. Olin Corp.* jointly drafted a discovery survey that was administered in person by neutral third parties, thus replacing interrogatories and depositions. It resulted in substantial savings in both time and cost. (Diamond, 2000, p. 233-235).”

35. The value of surveys in court was affirmed by Jay and Levine (2005; *Litigation surveys*. In S. J. Best and B. Radcliff (Eds.), *Polling America: An encyclopedia of public opinion*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press):

“Litigation surveys benefit the legal process by providing information on disputed issues that could not feasibly be presented in court through conventional means. In class action lawsuits, mass torts litigation, or other court cases involving numerous plaintiffs who are potential witnesses, survey evidence presented by a single witness effectively can substitute for the testimony of hundreds, even thousands. This can shorten the litigation process, reduce litigation costs, and ease court congestion. Moreover, survey evidence derived from a representative sample of a large class of potential witnesses may

in fact prove more reliable than the testimony of a few individuals selected from that class, since a few handpicked witnesses may not be truly representative of the whole. A clear preference for survey evidence in appropriate cases has been expressed by the federal judiciary through litigation reference materials published by the Federal Judicial Center (Jay & Levine 2003, p. 433).”

36. These characterizations of the value of surveys in court are directly applicable to the present case. Rather than spending the time and money necessary to collect information about experiences from an entire group of people through direct testimony, a survey can be conducted to efficiently collect scientifically projectable results that will describe a population of interest within a specifiable margin of error.

37. Survey research methodology is now a solid science, with widely agreed-upon principles of optimal design for sampling, questionnaire construction, data collection, and data analysis. Experts in this field, including myself, routinely belong to and attend annual conferences sponsored by professional associations such as the American Association for Public Opinion Research and subscribe to journals such as Public Opinion Quarterly, the Journal of Official Statistics, the International Journal of Public Opinion Research, and other such periodicals to track the latest advances in survey methodology.

Design of the First Champion Survey

38. Thus far, I have offered reasons to believe that a survey can be done efficiently and can accurately inform the Court about people’s perceptions of consumer products. To conduct a survey for this case, a series of methodological choices had to be made, and I outline these choices below, along with considerations that influenced how such choices were made in this investigation.

39. One choice involves the mode of data collection. Many survey researchers believe that the highest response rates and most accurate measurements can be achieved if respondents are contacted face-to-face at their homes and are interviewed in person, and empirical evidence supports this belief (see, e.g., Holbrook, A. L., Green, M. C., & Krosnick, J. A. 2003. Telephone vs. face-to-face interviewing of national probability samples with long questionnaires: Comparisons of respondent satisficing and social desirability response bias. Public Opinion Quarterly, 67, 79-125). This method is extremely time-consuming and expensive and is used only in the highest visibility surveys done by the federal government and academic researchers. Much more common and cost-effective are surveys conducted by telephone, paper-and-pencil questionnaires, or questionnaires administered via the Internet.

40. When choosing among these three survey modes, it is important to consider the accuracy of the measurements obtained. First, consider the choice between telephone interviewing and a paper questionnaire. Dozens of published studies have compared information collected via telephone interviews with comparable information collected via paper questionnaires. Unfortunately, most of these studies involved design flaws (e.g., non-random assignment of individuals to survey modes, cross-over designs wherein the same respondent provides data in multiple modes, the use of different questionnaires in the different modes) that preclude reaching clear conclusions about differences between the modes in terms of results. And almost none of these studies reported any analyses comparing the validity of the measurements obtained via the two modes.

41. One study that made such a comparison and is especially relevant to the present case was conducted by Silver and myself (Silver, M. D., & Krosnick, J. A. 2001. An experimental comparison of the quality of data obtained in telephone and self-administered mailed surveys

with a listed sample. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Montreal, Canada). In this study, each member of a representative sample of commercial airline pilots was randomly assigned to be interviewed either by telephone or to complete paper questionnaires. Respondents were asked to report the number of times they had witnessed various types of safety-related events while working in the cockpit of a commercial airliner during a specific period of time. Respondents were randomly assigned to one of various lengths of recall periods, ranging from one week to six months. If respondents reported event frequencies accurately, then there should be a linear relation between the number of days in the recall period and the number of safety-related events reported, mediated by the number of hours flown in the recall period by each pilot. That is, the longer a pilot's assigned recall period, the more hours he should have flown, and the more hours a pilot flew, the more safety-related events he or she should have witnessed. The more measurement error was contained in answers to the event frequency questions, the weaker the relation between these variables would have been. Therefore, the strength of this statistical relation can be viewed as a measure of the validity of the reports provided.

42. Silver and Krosnick (2001) found the relation between hours flown and number of events reported to be 20% stronger among respondents interviewed by telephone than among respondents who completed paper and pencil questionnaires, a statistically significant difference. Furthermore, the telephone respondents expressed significantly greater confidence in the accuracy of their event reports. The higher accuracy and confidence seem to be attributable to the fact that the paper questionnaire respondents rushed through the process of answering, spending only 13 minutes on average completing the questionnaire, as compared to the 19 minutes on average spent by respondents interviewed by telephone, a statistically significant difference. This

set of results suggests caution about employing paper questionnaires to collect data for the current case.

43. The third standard mode that could be employed is questionnaire administration via computers and the Internet. It is possible to conduct Internet surveys of scientific, representative, samples of members of a population if these individuals have been selected truly randomly from the population of interest and recruited to join a long-term panel and to complete questionnaires regularly (e.g., every week or two). This method has proven to yield results that are generally as accurate as, or more accurate than, the results yielded by comparable telephone surveys of the same population (see, e.g., Chang, L., & Krosnick, J. A. 2009. National surveys via RDD telephone interviewing vs. the Internet: Comparing sample representativeness and response quality. Public Opinion Quarterly, 73, 641-678; Chang, L., & Krosnick, J. A. 2010. Comparing oral interviewing with self-administered computerized questionnaires: An experiment. Public Opinion Quarterly, 74, 154-167; MacInnis, B., Krosnick, J. A., Ho, A. S., & Cho, M-J. 2018. The accuracy of measurements with probability survey samples: Replication and extension. Public Opinion Quarterly, 82, 707-744; Pasek, J. 2015. When will nonprobability surveys mirror probability surveys? Considering types of inference and weighting strategies as criteria for correspondence. International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 28, 269-291; Yeager, D. S., Krosnick, J. A., Chang, L., Javitz, H. S., Levendusky, M. S., Simpser, A., & Wang, R. 2011. Comparing the accuracy of RDD telephone surveys and Internet surveys conducted with probability and non-probability samples. Public Opinion Quarterly, 75, 709-747). Because of this track record, I chose Internet data collection for this survey.²

² The vast majority of Internet surveys done these days are not done with random, representative samples who are systematically selected from a well-defined population, all of whom have a known, non-zero probability of selection. Instead, these surveys are done with people who were

Procedure for Implementing the First Champion Survey

44. In order to implement a survey in this case, the following sequence of events was executed (for details, see the Technical Report in this document). First, I designed a questionnaire that displayed packaging of one Acana product or one Orijen product and asked questions that assessed perceptions of the quality and healthiness of the products and asked respondents whether they would or would not purchase the product at a specified price, in addition to a variety of questions about people's experiences owning dogs. Each respondent saw one package and answered questions about that product.

45. The questionnaire was then administered to a large, nationally representative sample of American adults ages 18 years old and older by the National Opinion Research Center, a well-established and highly respected survey research organization with extensive experience collecting survey data of all types.

Evaluation of the Survey in Light of Criteria Articulated by Dr. Shari Diamond

46. Dr. Shari Diamond, Professor at Northwestern University, has written an authoritative text on the uses of surveys in court, and she provided guidelines for evaluating survey evidence and principles to guide survey design in order to yield reliable data. In the most recent edition of that chapter, Dr. Diamond listed a series of questions that should be asked about any survey evidence that is submitted for a court's consideration (Diamond, S.S. 2011. Reference Guide on Survey Research. In The Federal Judicial Center and National Research Council of the National

not systematically sampled and instead volunteered to complete questionnaires to make money in response to banner ads on websites, email invitations sent to non-representative groups of people (e.g., members of the United Airlines frequent flier club), and other such recruitment methods that do not involve random sampling from any population. There is no scientific justification for the claim that such samples describe populations of interest, and such samples routinely produce results that are considerably less accurate than those yielded by truly random samples.

Academies Reference Manual on Scientific Evidence, Third Edition). Next, I address each of these questions (listed as headers in italics) with regard to the survey conducted in this case.

Was the Survey Designed to Address Relevant Questions?

47. The survey was designed to address these questions of interest:

- How did learning about the risk of the presence of certain heavy metals (lead, mercury, cadmium, and arsenic) and non-natural substances (BPA) in the foods, learning that the foods were not always made with fresh regional ingredients, and learning that the foods were sometimes made with ingredients from third parties impact the value of the dog foods to consumers?
- How did learning about the risk of the presence of certain heavy metals (lead, mercury, cadmium, and arsenic) and non-natural substances (BPA) in the foods, learning that the foods were not always made with fresh regional ingredients, and learning that the foods were sometimes made with ingredients from third parties impact consumers' perceptions of the quality and healthiness of the dog foods?

Was Participation in the Design, Administration, and Interpretation of the Survey

Appropriately Controlled to Ensure the Objectivity of the Survey?

48. I designed the survey and interpreted the obtained data. In doing so, I worked with employees of The Strategy Team. These individuals took all necessary steps to ensure objectivity in all of their activities. The survey was designed according to principles of best practices in survey research and questionnaire design, and the analysis of the data and interpretation of the analysis results were done according to widely-accepted principles in social science, all intended to assure objectivity and accuracy.

49. NORC selected and invited potential survey respondents to complete a questionnaire via

the Internet. All staff at NORC who participated in the collection of the survey data were unaware that this project was linked to litigation and were unaware of who paid for the costs of the survey, with a few exceptions. These exceptions were individuals who were (1) high-level managers who had no direct conversations with the respondents and never discussed the litigation-relevance of the study with any other employees at NORC, or (2) financial staff who accepted payment for the costs of the project and had no contact with the respondents and never discussed the litigation-relevance of the study with any other employees at NORC.

Are the Experts Who Designed, Conducted, or Analyzed the Survey Appropriately Skilled and Experienced?

50. The experts involved in the design, conduct, and analysis of this survey are appropriately skilled and experienced. They include:

- Jon Krosnick: I earned an A.B. from Harvard University in psychology and an M.A. and a PhD. from the University of Michigan in social psychology. As a part of my undergraduate and graduate studies, I received extensive training in social psychology, survey and experimental research techniques, and statistical data analysis. I have decades of experience conducting hundreds of surveys and am a nationally recognized expert in survey research. I have held faculty positions at The Ohio State University and Stanford University and have worked as a consultant for numerous organizations. I am a staff researcher at the U.S. Census Bureau advising and participating in survey research. I have served as the Co-Principal Investigator of the American National Election Studies, the nation's pre-eminent survey study of voters and elections. I have served as editor or reviewer for the top peer-reviewed journals in the social sciences. My research has been recognized by the Erik H. Erikson Early Career Award, by election as a Fellow by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and the American Association for the Advancement of Science, two fellowships at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, and election as a fellow by the American Psychological Association, the American Psychological Society, and the Society for Personality and Social Psychology. In addition, I was awarded the lifetime career achievement award from the American Association for Public Opinion Research, the world's leading professional organization of survey researchers.
- Amanda Scott: Dr. Scott earned a B.A. from Ohio Wesleyan University and an M.A. and PhD. from the Ohio State University. Dr. Amanda Scott is a social psychologist whose academic training focused primarily on stereotyping, group

behavior, and legal decision-making and involved extensive training in methodology. As a graduate student, she began collaborating with me by conducting a large-scale survey of passengers at the Port Columbus International Airport. As field director for that project, she was responsible for all data collection activities and for statistical analysis of the data. She has over 14 years of professional and consulting experience in applied research, including project management and statistical support work with me in my conduct of survey research in the context of litigation.

Are the Experts Who Will Testify About Surveys Conducted by Others Appropriately Skilled and Experienced?

51. I am qualified to discuss the survey that I conducted.

Was an Appropriate Universe or Population Identified?

52. For this survey, the population is all adults living in the United States, age 18 and older.

Did the Sampling Frame Approximate the Population?

53. The sampling frame was a comprehensive set of residential addresses in the U.S.

Does the Sample Approximate the Relevant Characteristics of the Population?

What Is the Evidence That Nonresponse Did Not Bias the Results of the Survey?

54. A sample of U.S. adults age 18 and older was selected from NORC's AmeriSpeak Panel for this study. Members of that panel were recruited from the U.S. population via probability sampling. Standard procedures for base-weighting and post-stratification were implemented to assure a match of the sample to the population.

What Procedures Were Used to Reduce the Likelihood of a Biased Sample?

55. The respondents were members of a panel of individuals whose households were selected randomly from the nation's population of households. Respondents were offered financial incentives to join the panel and complete questionnaires regularly. Multiple invitations were sent to panel members inviting them to complete the questionnaire for this survey. For the subset of

panelists who prefer to complete surveys by telephone rather than on the Internet, a postcard was mailed to their home addresses, and telephone calls were made to encourage these panel members to complete the questionnaire online. Statistical weighting was implemented to adjust for unequal probability of selection into the panel by design when the panel was created.

What Precautions Were Taken to Ensure That Only Qualified Respondents Were Included in the Survey?

56. All respondents were qualified to participate – none were screened out.

Were Questions on the Survey Framed to Be Clear, Precise, and Unbiased?

57. The questions were drafted according to the principles of optimal questionnaire measurement identified in the published peer reviewed academic literatures on survey methodology and related fields, drawing on my expertise and years of experience in the field. I have published numerous papers on this topic and am confident that I crafted questions that were clear, precise, and unbiased. These best practices principles are designed to maximize question clarity and precision and to avoid bias.

Were Some Respondents Likely to Have No Opinion? If So, What Steps Were Taken to Reduce Guessing?

58. Respondents saw photographs of one of two dog food packages, answered questions about whether they would purchase that dog food at a specified price, their perceptions of the quality and healthiness of the food, and about their experiences owning dogs.

59. A large volume of literature suggests that sometimes when answering questions, respondents hesitate before answering because they are not completely sure of the meaning of a question or the meanings of answer choices or are uncertain about whether they are sufficiently confident in their answers to justify expressing an opinion (e.g., Krosnick, J. A. 2002. The causes

of no-opinion responses to attitude measures in surveys: They rarely are what they appear to be. In R. M. Groves, D. A. Dillman, J. L. Eltinge, and R. J. A. Little (Eds.), Survey Nonresponse. New York: Wiley, 88-100). Research has indicated that in such situations, it is best to encourage respondents to answer substantively, even if they are not completely sure, because their answers are highly likely to reveal reliable judgments. But if a respondent prefers not to answer, he or she should be permitted to do so. (e.g., Krosnick, J. A., & Presser, S. 2010. Questionnaire design. In J. D. Wright & P. V. Marsden (Eds.), Handbook of Survey Research (Second Edition). West Yorkshire, England: Emerald Group).

60. In this survey, if a respondent volunteered that he or she did not know the answer to a question (by skipping the question), the following message was displayed: “We noticed that you didn’t answer the question below. We would be really grateful if you’d be willing to answer it as accurately as you can, even if you’re not completely sure of your answer. But if you prefer not to answer the question, just click on the blue button below.” If the respondent skipped the question again, he or she was not probed further, and the next question was displayed.

Did the Survey Use Open-Ended or Closed-Ended Questions? How Was the Choice in Each Instance Justified?

61. The large volume of literature on questionnaire design indicates that an open-ended format is optimal when the construct being measured is (1) a number, or (2) non-numeric and categorical, with a universe of possible answers that cannot be known in advance of administering the survey. Otherwise, closed-ended questions function well (e.g., Krosnick, J. A., & Presser, S. 2010. Questionnaire design. In J. D. Wright & P. V. Marsden (Eds.), Handbook of Survey Research (Second Edition). West Yorkshire, England: Emerald Group).

62. In this survey, all measurements of numbers were made using open-ended questions. For

example, respondents were asked how many dogs they had owned: "What is the total number of dogs you have owned since you were 18 years old?" No questions involved answer choices that were non-numeric and categorical with an unknown universe of possible responses.

If Probes Were Used to Clarify Ambiguous or Incomplete Answers, What Steps Were Taken to Ensure That the Probes Were Not Leading and Were Administered in a Consistent Fashion?

63. No probes were used in this survey.

What Approach Was Used to Avoid or Measure Potential Order or Context Effects?

64. Question order effects (also called context effects) occur when asking one question changes a person's answers to a subsequent question, which would have been answered differently had the prior question not been asked. Although the scholarly literature has documented question order effects for particular types of questions (e.g., asking a general question before asking specific versions of the same question, such as whether you like your life overall and whether you like specific aspects of your life), in general, question order effects have been found to occur rarely. For example, Smith (Smith, T. W. 1991. Context effects in the General Social Survey. In P. P. Biemer, R. M. Groves, L. E. Lyberg, N. A. Mathiowetz, & S. Sudman (Eds.), Measurement Error in Surveys. New York: John Wiley) conducted a large-scale analysis of many experiments and found that "Overall the number of context effects created by the rotation design employed by the GSS prior to 1988 are minuscule; 11-12 probable order effects out of over 500 variables" (p. 69). Similarly, Schuman and Presser (Schuman, H., & Presser, S. 1981. Questions and Answers in Attitude Surveys: Experiments on Question Form, Wording, and Context. New York: Academic Press) conducted a similar analysis with data from 113 different experiments and found 8 statistically significant effects, just two more than would

be expected by chance alone. Therefore, the threat of question order effects is quite minimal.

65. Diamond (2011) suggested using a particular type of order when asking general and specific questions on the same topic, but this study's questionnaire included no such sequences. She also suggested randomizing the order of questions to minimize the potential for question order effects. We did not do this because no question sequences in the questionnaire match ones that past research indicates were at risk for question order effects. And randomizing question order would transform an orderly sequence of questions into an incomprehensible shuffling from question topic to question topic and thereby compromise measurement quality.

If the Survey Was Designed to Test a Causal Proposition, Did the Survey Include an Appropriate Control Group or Question?

66. Causal propositions were tested by randomly assigning respondents to read one of 256 combinations of corrective statements about a dog food. For each of 8 corrective statements, half of the respondents were the control group, meaning that they did not see that statement, and the other half of the respondents were the treatment group, meaning that they did see the corrective statement.

What Limitations Are Associated with the Mode of Data Collection Used in the Survey?

67. Self-administration via computers has been shown to yield especially accurate measurements when a probability sample is recruited, as was done for this study.

Were the Interviewers Appropriately Selected and Trained?

68. No interviewers were involved in conducting this survey. Telephone calls were made to encourage respondents to complete the questionnaire, but these interviewers did not collect any data. NORC chose their most reliable interviewers, and TST staff listened to interviewers and gave feedback to them prior to the start of calling.

What Did the Interviewers Know About the Survey and Its Sponsorship?

69. None of the interviewers who called potential respondents knew about the sponsorship of the survey or its purpose.

What Procedures Were Used to Ensure and Determine That the Survey Was Administered to Minimize Error and Bias?

70. Diamond (2011) listed three methods for ensuring that a survey is administered to minimize error and bias: monitoring interviews, validation of interviews, and reviewing the work done by individual interviewers. None of these apply in the present case, because interviewers were not involved in data collection.

What Was Done to Ensure That the Data Were Recorded Accurately?

71. No interviewers collected or recorded data in this study, so data entry from interviewers is not a concern. Extensive testing of the online questionnaire was conducted to ensure that answers were recorded accurately.

What Was Done to Ensure That the Grouped Data Were Classified Consistently and Accurately?

72. No data were coded in this study.

When Was Information About the Survey Methodology and Results Disclosed?

73. Information about the survey methodology and results is disclosed fully in this report.

Does the Survey Report Include Complete and Detailed Information on All Relevant Characteristics?

74. Diamond (2011) listed several specific areas that should be discussed in any survey report, and all are discussed here. These include:

- “The purpose of the survey” (p. 415): This is described in this report.

- “A definition of the target population and a description of the sampling frame” (p. 415): This is described in this report.
- “A description of the sample design, including the method of selecting respondents, the method of interview, the number of callbacks, respondent eligibility or screening criteria and method, and other pertinent information” (p. 415): This is described in this report.
- “A description of the results of sample implementation, including the number of potential respondents contacted, potential respondents not reached, noneligibles, refusals, incomplete interviews or terminations, and completed interviews” (p. 415): The equivalent of these for online surveys are included in this report.
- “The exact wording of the questions used, including a copy of each version of the actual questionnaire, interviewer instructions, and visual exhibits” (p. 415): This is described in this report.
- “A description of any special scoring (e.g., grouping of verbatim responses into broader categories)” (p. 416): This did not occur in this study.
- “A description of any weighting or estimating procedures used” (p. 416): This is described in this report.
- “Estimates of the sampling error, where appropriate (i.e., in probability samples)” (p. 416): This is described in this report.
- “Statistical tables clearly labeled and identified regarding the source of the data, including the number of raw cases forming the base for each table, row, or column” (p. 416): This is done in this report.
- “Copies of interviewer instructions, validation results, and code books.” (p. 416): Since interviewers did not collect data in this study, this report does not address issues involving interviewers. No codebooks were created.

In Surveys of Individuals, What Measures Were Taken to Protect the Identities of Individual Respondents?

75. None of the primary researchers (me and employees at The Strategy Team) were provided information about who was selected to be invited to participate in the survey or who participated.

76. All identifying information was stored on password-protected computers. In the data files possessed by the primary researchers, respondents were identified only by numbers that could not be connected to their names. Only NORC had access to that link for sample management and incentive fulfillment purposes, and NORC employees are professionally committed to protecting these identities and never revealing them, according to the code of ethics of the professional association of their industry, the American Association for Public Opinion Research.

77. Diamond (2011) said that “Copies of all questionnaires should be made available upon request so that the opposing party has an opportunity to evaluate the raw data. All identifying information, such as the respondent’s name, address, and telephone number, should be removed to ensure respondent confidentiality” (p. 418). In keeping with this advice, the identities of respondents are not provided as part of the survey documentation in this report, and the primary investigators do not possess such information.

Results

78. The results of this survey support a series of conclusions (details are provided in the Technical Report in this document): providing information about the risk of the presence of heavy metals and BPA in the dog foods and providing corrective information about the local sourcing, use of fresh ingredients, and participation of third parties in manufacturing decreased the value of the dog food by measurable amounts, and also decreased the perceived quality and healthiness of the dog foods.

79. The impact of corrective statements on value is shown in the next table.

**Percent Decrease in the Value of the Product
With Increasing Numbers of Corrective Statements**

Number of corrective statements	Percent decrease in value
1	-10.7%
2	-20.3%
3	-28.8%
4	-36.4%
5	-43.3%
6	-49.3%
7	-54.8%
8	-59.6%

80. I also found that the impact of the number of corrective statements on the decision to purchase the products and how the products were evaluated was observed among various subgroups of respondents, including: people who spent more money on dog food and people who did not do this, people who owned more dogs and people who did not, people who owned dogs during the class period and people who did not, people who bought dog food from a pet store and did not, completed the questionnaire earlier in the field period and people who completed it later, people who took longer to complete the questionnaire and people who did not, people were female, were not female, were more educated, were not more educated, had higher household incomes, were married, were older, and were not older, who did not live in households by themselves or with only one other person, people who lived in a household with at least one child under 18 years old, and people who did not live in those households, people who lived in households that were not limited to cellular telephone service, people who live in a one family,

people who lived in homes that were owned or being bought by one of the members of the household, people who lived in a detached home, people who live in the Northeast or Midwest and people who do not live in these areas, people who are working as a paid employee, people who are white and non-Hispanic, and people who are not white and non-Hispanic.

81. In sum, the results are consistent with the conclusion that disclosing additional information about the manufacturing and ingredients of the dog foods decreased their value and perceived quality and healthiness by measurable amounts.

82. Because the number of units of each dog food sold is a known fact and fixed as a matter of history, it is possible to use the results of this survey to calculate damages in this case. Because the respondents in this survey constitute a representative sample of American consumers, and because the findings are observed to be widely generalizable across population subgroups, the survey is designed to allow application of the results to all purchases of Champion dog foods during the class period.

Conclusion

83. This case constitutes a sensible context in which to take advantage of the science of survey research methodology for informing the Court. By designing and implementing a survey implementing best practices, data were gathered on the central issues at stake in this case efficiently and cost-effectively.

I make this declaration under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States and the State of California this 13th day of August, 2019, at Portola Valley, California.



Jon A. Krosnick

Technical Report
Survey Methods and Results

INTRODUCTION

1. A study was conducted to gather information about people's perceptions of dog foods made by Champion. To do this, the following steps were taken.
2. First, case documents were reviewed. Then a questionnaire was designed to measure the value of Champion dog foods and perceptions of their quality and healthiness, in addition to additional assessments of respondents' experiences owning dogs.
3. Plaintiffs' attorneys provided images of 13-pound packages of two Champion products: Orijen Six Fish dog food, and Acana Duck and Pear Singles dog food. These were the focus of the experiment embedded in the survey to assess values and to assess perceptions of quality and healthiness.
4. Images of the packages of 70 other Champion products were also provided by Plaintiffs' attorneys. As the two photos arrays displayed next indicate, the products are visually very similar to one another.

Images of the Fronts of All of the Packages Included in this Analysis





Images of the Backs of All of the Packages Included in this Analysis





5. An analysis was conducted to assess the similarity of these packages to one another. Four of the sets of package images were missing one or more sides³ of the package. These 6 sets of images were excluded from the analysis. Out of these 70 products, 66 were included in the analysis, bringing the total number of unique product packages included to 68.
6. To conduct this analysis, elements that were present on the packages were identified, and the packages were analyzed to determine what percentage of the packages contained each element. Two researchers reviewed each set of packages to judge whether the packages

³ The four products without sides were: Orijen Puppy 5lb 2014, Orijen Adult Freeze Dried Dog 16oz 2018, Orijen Regional Red Freeze Dried 16oz 2018, and Orijen Tundra Freeze Dried Dog 16oz 2018.

contained the element in question, and a third researcher resolved any disagreements. As the next table suggests, the packages in this set uniformly or nearly uniformly share many common elements with the Orijen Six Fish dog food and Acana Duck and Pear Singles dog food shown to respondents, which justifies generalizing the findings of this experiment across packages.

Percent of Packages with Each Package Element Present

Element (Text, Image, or Idea that Appears on the Package)	Percent of Packages with the Element Present (N = 68)
"Acana" or "Orijen"	100%
Type of food (E.g., Six Fish, Duck & Pear, Tundra, Regional Red, Meadowland)	100%
“Biologically appropriate” ⁴	100%
“Never outsourced”	100%
List of percentages of animal ingredients vs. vegetables, fruits, and/or botanicals vs. grain, potato, gluten(s)/tapioca, plant protein concentrates, oats and/or GMO	100%
"Vegetables"	100%
"Fresh" ingredients	100%
"Regional" ingredients	100%
Photo of vista / outdoors / agricultural landscape	100%
Statement about vista / outdoors / landscape shown (e.g. "AMERICA'S VAST AND FERTILE LANDS")	100%
Caption to photo of vista / outdoors / agricultural landscape contains "Our source of inspiration"	100%
Statement about keeping dogs happy and strong	100%
Icons for biologically appropriate, fresh regional ingredients, and never outsourced	100%
"All...life stages"	100%
Total weight of food in package	100%

⁴ The capitalization of words varied in some cases. It is considered a match to this direct quote if all of the words appeared in the same order.

Element (Text, Image, or Idea that Appears on the Package)	Percent of Packages with the Element Present (N = 68)
Photo of a supplier (farmer, fisher, etc), with person and business name	100%
Ingredients	100%
Calorie Content: metabolizable energy (ME) listed	100%
"Guaranteed analysis" table	100%
Daily ration and feeding guide / feeding instructions based on size	100%
Rations / instructions for puppies, gestation, and lactation	100%
Champion Petfoods / Champion Freeze-dried / Dogstar Kitchens / Northstar Kitchens Logo	100%
Address of company / location where product produced	100%
Customer care information	100%
"Formulated to meet the nutritional levels established by the AAFCO Dog Food Nutrient Profiles for all life stages."	100%
Graphic of plant(s) and/or animal(s) (ingredients)	100%
"championpetfoods.com"	100%
Reference to "trusted" supplier / producer	100%
Ingredients delivered fresh, raw, and/or daily	100%
Description of key ingredients in food	99%
"Fruits"	99%
0(%) (any of following) grain, potato, gluten(s)/tapioca, plant protein concentrates, GMO	97%
"People we (know and) trust"	97%
Reference to wolf ancestry / evolution / evolutionary diet	97%
Statement that food is made / prepared in company's own kitchens	97%
Statement suggesting the food is low in additives or preservatives or is preserved naturally	97%
"Wholeprey" or "Whole Prey"	96%

Element (Text, Image, or Idea that Appears on the Package)	Percent of Packages with the Element Present (N = 68)
"Botanicals"	96%
Photo of plant(s) or animal(s) (ingredients)	96%
"Organs"	96%
Facebook, Twitter, and/or Instagram icons	96%
Social media handle(s)	96%
Statement about how each dog is unique	94%
"Cartilage"	94%
"Calories distributed to support peak conditioning with" [XX% from protein], [XX% from carbohydrates], [XX% from fat], [etc.]	94%
"All breeds"	91%
Statement suggesting that reading the ingredients will please the reader	90%
Statement about the food being rich in protein	88%
Signature of Reinhard Muhlenfeld, Founder	85%
Daily ration based on activity level	85%
"Award-winning" (or shows awards won)	84%
Refers to (Mother) Nature's wisdom, designs, or intentions (besides / in addition to "Nourish as nature intended")	82%
"Easy open"	79%
Statement suggesting that the food is low in carbohydrates	79%
Freeze-dried ingredients (mentioned on package besides in ingredient list)	79%
Made in the USA / Made in Canada	78%
"Trusted everywhere"	74%
"Ingredients we love"	74%
Provides weight of the key ingredients in the package (e.g., 1lb whole Atlantic mackerel)	74%

Element (Text, Image, or Idea that Appears on the Package)	Percent of Packages with the Element Present (N = 68)
Proportion fresh (or raw) and proportion dried (or oils) (e.g. "Half are FRESH or RAW and loaded with goodness and taste, and half are DRIED or OILS that provide a strong and natural source of animal proteins and fats.")	74%
Statement about pride (e.g. "Prepared with pride" or "Kentucky Proud")	71%

7. A questionnaire was designed according to best practices in survey research. The final version of the questionnaire appears in Appendix B.

Survey Design

8. Each respondent was randomly assigned to see one of two dog food packages:
- 50 percent of respondents saw Orijen Six Fish.
 - 50 percent of respondents saw Acana Duck and Pear Singles.
9. After seeing photos of one side of the package, respondents read a transcript of all of the words on the side they had just viewed. This process was repeated for all sides of the package.
10. Next, respondents read between zero and eight pieces of additional information. Each of the eight pieces of additional information was a statement provided by Plaintiffs' attorneys to correct alleged misinformation on the Champion packaging. The display of each piece of information was independently randomly assigned to sample members before they started answering the questionnaire, using random numbers obtained from random.org. Thus, for each corrective statement, each respondent was randomly assigned to either see it or not see it. The order of presentation of the corrective statements was also randomized across respondents. The eight corrective statements were:
- Laboratory testing has shown there is a risk that this food may contain mercury. The World Health Organization has said that in humans, "Mercury may have toxic effects on the nervous, digestive and immune systems, and on lungs, kidneys, skin and eyes."
 - Laboratory testing has shown there is a risk that this food may contain cadmium. A federal public health agency of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, has found, "Kidney and bone effects have also been observed in laboratory animals ingesting cadmium. Anemia, liver disease, and nerve or brain damage have been observed in animals eating or drinking cadmium."

- Laboratory testing has shown there is a risk that this food may contain lead. The Food & Drug Administration has said, “Lead is poisonous to humans and can affect people of any age or health status.”
- Laboratory testing has shown there is a risk that this food may contain arsenic. The Environmental Protection Agency has said, “Arsenic has been linked to a number of cancers. These include cancer of the bladder, lungs, skin, kidney, nasal passages, liver, and prostate.”
- Laboratory testing has shown there is a risk that this food may contain BPA. The Food & Drug Administration has said, “BPA is an industrial chemical used to make polycarbonate, a hard, clear plastic, which is used in many consumer products.”
- The manufacturer of this food has stated that it may include ingredients that are not delivered to them fresh but have been frozen before they are used to make the dog food.
- The manufacturer of this food has stated that it may include ingredients that are sourced outside the region where it is manufactured. This may include not only other regions within the United States but also other regions internationally.
- The manufacturer of this food has stated that it uses third parties to process and manufacture protein meals and tallows used in its dog foods.

11. After reading the corrective statements, respondents who indicated they had ever owned a dog were asked whether they would buy the product at a specified price.

12. Respondents who saw the Orijen Six Fish product were randomly assigned to see one of the following five prices:

- \$47.99
- \$50.99
- \$53.49
- \$55.99
- \$58.99

13. Respondents who saw the Acana Duck and Pear Singles product were randomly assigned to see one of the following five prices:

- \$37.99
- \$39.99
- \$41.99
- \$43.99
- \$45.99

14. These prices surrounded the manufacturer's suggested retail price for the product, including prices about 10 percent below, about 5 percent below, about 5 percent above, and about 10 percent above.⁵
15. The price to which each respondent was randomly assigned was inserted into the following question:
 - *fc(1/2)pc(1/2/3/4/5): If you were buying dog food, and the 13lb bag of dog food you just saw was available for sale at a price of [PRICE], would you buy it, or would you not buy it?*
16. Respondents were also asked a series of questions about their experiences owning dogs as well as some questions about their own lifestyle and demographics.

Respondents

17. The National Opinion Research Center (NORC) provided the respondents for the survey. The respondents were members of their AmeriSpeak panel. The panel members were recruited by a process that began with random selection of residential addresses in the U.S. People living at those addresses received invitations to join the panel and complete questionnaires regularly. A description of the methodology used to build the AmeriSpeak Panel appears in the field report provided by NORC in Appendix C (See NORC Appendix 1).
18. NORC sent emails to potential respondents inviting them to complete the questionnaire for this study. The emails provided a link to the online questionnaire. Respondents could access the questionnaire by clicking the link or by clicking a link in their personalized portal at the AmeriSpeak website.
19. The questionnaire was programmed in software hosted by SurveyGizmo. At the conclusion of the SurveyGizmo questionnaire, respondents were redirected back to the AmeriSpeak website, which recorded that the respondent had completed the questionnaire, so the respondent could receive AmeriSpeak points as compensation (valued at approximately \$5 initially; this incentive was increased to \$10 one week after the data collection was launched).
20. Among the group of AmeriSpeak panel members selected to be invited to participate in this study, a random subset of 1,059 of these individuals was selected to be invited before everyone else. Invitations were sent to these individuals on March 20, 2019. Then, on March 21, after proper operation of the questionnaire software had been confirmed, email invitations were sent to all other members of the sample. On March 26, 2019, a reminder email was sent to all potential respondents who had not yet completed the questionnaire. Additional reminders were sent on March 29, 2019, April 1, 2019 and April 2, 2019. 3,729 members of the invited sample were "telephone preference" panel members, meaning they preferred to

⁵See CPF2117043-CPF2117045

complete surveys by telephone rather than the Internet. These panel members were called by NORC to invite them to participate in the survey. An average of 3.4 telephone calls were made to telephone preference panel members throughout the field period. These panel members also received postcards notifying them of the survey opportunity.

21. All emails sent to potential respondents, as well as the screens from NORC's online questionnaire, appear in the field report from NORC in Appendix C. Data were downloaded and final weights were computed for the analyses in this report on the morning of April 2, 2019.
22. 24,881 panel members were invited to complete the questionnaire, and 6,728 did so, so the completion rate is 27.0% percent. The survey had a cumulative response rate of 7.9% (ORR2 - see Callegaro, M., & DiSogra, C. 2008). The response rate was calculated using the panel recruitment rate and panel retention rate (provided by NORC) and the completion rate. See next table.

Cumulative Response Rate of Survey

Panel Recruitment Response Rate	Panel Retention Rate	Survey Completion Rate	ORR2
34.2%	85.1%	27.0%	7.9%

Data File Preparation

23. SurveyGizmo software recorded all activities performed by people completing the questionnaire. Before analysis was done, the following steps were taken to properly prepare the dataset.
 - Some rows of data in the file did not contain a respondent ID number. Such a row was created when a respondent did not begin the questionnaire properly (by clicking the invitation link) and instead typed the questionnaire link into the address bar of a browser window or when a bot randomly stumbled on the questionnaire on the internet. All of these rows of data were removed from the datafile.
 - Some respondents stopped answering questions before completing the entire questionnaire.⁶ If those respondents later attempted to continue completing the questionnaire, the questionnaire restarted from the beginning to ensure that respondents remembered all directions and had seen all materials when answering questions. No data from these respondents' first incomplete questionnaires were analyzed. In total, 400

⁶ A respondent was considered to have completed the questionnaire if he or she progressed past this question: SEX: What is your sex? 33 respondents who progressed past this screen but did not submit a completed questionnaire, or submitted a completed questionnaire after progressing this screen are included in this analysis.

people began the questionnaire, stopped before completing, and did not return to later complete the questionnaire.

- Thirty respondents completed the questionnaire twice.⁷ This occurred when a respondent did not return to the NORC website at the end of completing the questionnaire the first time. In all such cases, data from the person's first time completing of the questionnaire were analyzed, and all subsequent responses were not analyzed.

Weighting

24. Using standard scientific procedures, data were weighted so that the respondents in the participating sample resembled the population from which respondents were drawn. More information on the weighting procedure appears in Appendix D. In the next table, three sets of percentages are displayed: the percent of people in different demographic groups in the U.S. population according to CPS, ACS or NHIS benchmarks, the percent of respondents in different demographic groups in the dog food survey (before weighting the data) and the percent of respondents in different demographic groups in the dog food study (after weighting the data).

Demographic Group	CPS, ACS, or NHIS Percent Used as Weighting Target	Percent from Dog Food Survey With Base Weight Only (n = 6,728)	Percent from Dog Food Survey With Final Post- Stratification Weight (n = 6,728)
Male	48.44%	47.58%	48.44%
Female	51.56%	52.42%	51.56%
Married	52.70%	58.81%	52.70%
Widowed	6.06%	5.35%	6.06%
Divorced/Separated	12.41%	14.67%	12.41%
Never married	28.83%	21.17%	28.83%
Northeast	17.76%	18.79%	17.76%
Midwest	20.79%	24.05%	20.79%
South	37.70%	32.75%	37.70%
West	23.75%	24.41%	23.75%
Non-Metro Area	12.89%	12.82%	12.22%
Metro Area	87.11%	87.18%	87.78%

⁷ Two respondents completed the questionnaire four times; these respondents were excluded from the analysis.

Demographic Group	CPS, ACS, or NHIS Percent Used as Weighting Target	Percent from Dog Food Survey With Base Weight Only (n = 6,728)	Percent from Dog Food Survey With Final Post- Stratification Weight (n = 6,728)
One household member	14.37%	16.61%	14.37%
Two household members	34.66%	33.73%	34.66%
Three household members	18.76%	16.29%	18.76%
Four household members	17.28%	12.94%	17.28%
Five household members	8.50%	8.17%	8.50%
Six or more household members	6.42%	12.25%	6.42%
18-29	21.08%	14.54%	21.08%
30-44	25.02%	24.44%	25.02%
45-59	25.35%	25.52%	25.35%
60+	28.56%	35.50%	28.56%
No HS diploma	10.90%	2.93%	10.90%
HS graduate or equivalent	28.64%	19.10%	28.64%
Some college	28.20%	29.86%	28.20%
BA or above	32.25%	48.12%	32.25%
Home ownership - no	31.14%	21.20%	31.14%
Home ownership - yes	68.86%	78.80%	68.86%
White, non-Hispanic	63.49%	77.70%	63.49%
Black, non-Hispanic	11.87%	6.23%	11.87%
Hispanic	16.24%	8.45%	16.24%
Other/Multiple, non-Hispanic	8.40%	7.62%	8.40%
Working - as a paid employee	55.48%	52.79%	55.48%
Working - self-employed	6.42%	9.49%	6.42%
Not working - retired	18.63%	22.44%	18.63%
Not working - disabled	5.47%	4.01%	5.47%
Other Not Working	13.99%	11.27%	13.99%
Live in detached house	67.46%	73.92%	67.46%

Demographic Group	CPS, ACS, or NHIS Percent Used as Weighting Target	Percent from Dog Food Survey With Base Weight Only (n = 6,728)	Percent from Dog Food Survey With Final Post- Stratification Weight (n = 6,728)
Live in other structure	32.54%	26.08%	32.54%
Have internet access	10.38%	8.11%	11.76%
No not have internet access	89.62%	91.89%	88.24%

25. Throughout this report, weighted frequencies and percentages are displayed in the tables. The weighted total number of respondents may not equal the sum of the numbers of respondents in subgroups.

RESULTS

Impact of Corrective Statements on Decision to Purchase the Product

26. Of the 6,728 people who completed the questionnaire, 915 (or 13.6%) had never owned a dog and were not asked whether they would buy the product they saw. Another four respondents were asked if they ever owned a dog but declined to answer the question and were not asked if they would buy the product they saw. One respondent who had owned a dog declined to answer the question about whether he or she would buy the product. Therefore, a total of 5,808 respondents were included in the analysis of the impact of corrective statement on purchasing decisions.
27. The questionnaire included items tapping respondents' experiences owning dogs that indicated an inclination toward devoting effort to promoting the health of their dogs and toward promoting their own health. Those among these questions that manifested statistically significant relations with the purchasing decision in theoretically expected directions were submitted to principal components factor analyses. These analyses identified one factor related to the concern for dogs' health and safety and a second factor that involved purchasing healthy foods for oneself.
28. Nine items most strongly loaded on the first factor (referred to as "concern for dog"):
- *DOG_HEALTHY_PRES. How important to you is it that your dog is as healthy as possible? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?*⁸

⁸ Three other versions (DOG_HEALTHY_PAST, DOGS_HEALTHY_PRES, DOGS_HEALTHY_PAST) of this question were asked depending on whether the respondent currently or only formerly owned dogs and whether the respondent owned one dog or more than one dog. A summary variable collapsing across the four items was included in this analysis. See Appendix B for details.

- *DOG_SAFE_PRES. How important to you is it that your dog is as safe as possible? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?*⁹
- *BOOKS_INGRED. Did you ever read books, magazines, or information online to learn about what ingredients are in dog foods to decide which ones to buy, or did you never do that?*
- *FOOD_TASTE. If you were to buy dog food, when deciding which food to buy, how much attention would you pay to whether the food **tastes good to dogs**? A great deal of attention, a lot of attention, a moderate amount of attention, a little attention, or none at all?*
- *FOOD_HEALTH. If you were to buy dog food, when deciding which food to buy, how much attention would you pay to whether the food will **improve the health of dogs**? A great deal of attention, a lot of attention, a moderate amount of attention, a little attention, or none at all?*
- *FOOD_APPEARANCE. If you were to buy dog food, when deciding which food to buy, how much attention would you pay to whether the food will **improve the appearance of dogs**? A great deal of attention, a lot of attention, a moderate amount of attention, a little attention, or none at all?*
- *FOOD_ALLNATURAL. If you were to buy dog food, when deciding which food to buy, how much attention would you pay to whether the food is **all-natural**? A great deal of attention, a lot of attention, a moderate amount of attention, a little attention, or none at all?*
- *FOOD_GRAINFREE. If you were to buy dog food, when deciding which food to buy, how much attention would you pay to whether the food is **grain free**? A great deal of attention, a lot of attention, a moderate amount of attention, a little attention, or none at all?*
- *FOOD_ORGANIC. If you were to buy dog food, when deciding which food to buy, how much attention would you pay to whether the food is **organic**? A great deal of attention, a lot of attention, a moderate amount of attention, a little attention, or none at all?*

29. Responses to these nine questions were coded to range from 0 to 1, averaged to create an index and then squared to reflect an accelerating relation of the variables with purchasing decisions. The squared average is referred to as the “Concern for dog index.” For respondents who answered fewer than nine of the questions, their index score was the average of their

⁹ Three other versions of this question (DOG_SAFE_PAST, DOGS_SAFE_PRES, DOGS_SAFE_PAST) were asked depending on whether the respondent currently or only formerly owned dogs and whether the respondent owned one dog or more than one dog. A summary variable collapsing across the four items was included in this analysis. See Appendix B for details.

non-missing values. One respondent chose not answer any of the nine questions. Another 915 respondents were never asked these questions because they said they never owned a dog earlier in the questionnaire. The value of the index for these respondents was set to -1 to allow their evaluations of the products to be included in the analysis. Additionally, a dummy variable coded to indicate whether they were missing on this index was also included.

30. Two items loaded most strongly on the second factor (called “Purchase of non-GMO / Organic”):

- *P_SHOP_ORGANIC. When you shopped for groceries during the last month, did you ever buy **organic** products, or did you not do that?*
- *P_SHOP_NONGMO. When you shopped for groceries during the last month, do you ever buy **non-GMO** products, or do you not do that?*

31. Responses to these questions were coded to range from 0 to 1, then averaged to create an index and squared to create a “Purchase of non-GMO/Organic” index. For respondents who answered only one of the two questions, their index value was their non-missing answer. Six respondents chose not answer either of these two questions. The value of the index for these respondents was set to -1 to allow their evaluations of the products and their decisions to purchase the products to be included in the analysis. Additionally, a dummy variable coded to indicate whether they were missing on this index was also included.


32. Finally, the parameters of an ordinary least squares regression were estimated, predicting the decision of whether to buy the product using the number of corrective statements seen, controlling for the two indices, a dummy variable for each index that indicated the respondent did not answer any of the questions in the index, and three sets of dummy variables representing three demographic control variables (gender, age, and education), plus dummy variables to identify respondents with missing values on any of those variables.

Estimates of the Parameters of an OLS Regression Equation Predicting Whether Respondents Said They Would Purchase the Dog Food Using the Number of Corrective Statements Seen, Gender, Age, Education, the “Concern for dog” Index, and the “Purchase of non-GMO / Organic” Index

Predictor	Unstandardized Regression Coefficient	p-value
Number of corrective statements	-.02	.00
Gender (female = 1)	-.07	.00
Gender (missing = 1)	-.09	.07
Age (age 30 - 44 = 1)	-.07	.02
Age (age 45-59 = 1)	-.14	.00

Predictor	Unstandardized Regression Coefficient	p-value
Age (age 60 or older = 1)	-.14	.00
Education (HS graduate or equivalent = 1)	-.06	.10
Education (Some college = 1)	-.09	.01
Education (Bachelor's degree or more = 1)	-.05	.16
Concern for dog (1 = higher index score)	.20	.00
Missing concern for dog index (1 = missing)	-.56	.00
Purchase of non-GMO / organic (1 = higher index score)	.06	.00
Missing purchase of non-GMO/organic index (1 = missing)	.83	.00
Constant	.28	.00
N	5,808	
R ²	.08	

33. The impact of the number of corrective statements was negative and statistically significant, indicating that the more corrective statements a respondent read, the less likely he or she was to purchase the product, as shown in the next graph.



Impact of the Number of Corrective Statements on the Value of the Dog Food

34. Having established that the linear impact of corrective statements was statistically significant in predicting purchasing decisions, I conducted another regression to yield an easily interpretable estimate of the impact of the number of corrective statements on the value of the dog food. The methodology employed is the Lewbel-Watanabe estimation approach (see Lewbel, 2000 & Watanabe, 2010). This approach uses binary choice decision data (e.g., the decision to buy or not buy a product at a specific offered price) to identify the mean value of the product to consumers. This approach was used to identify the average decrease in value for each corrective statement viewed.
35. To implement the Lewbel-Watanabe approach, the purchasing decision was weighted by the price and the percent of respondents who said they would purchase the product (see Appendix E for more detail). The coefficients produced by a Poisson regression implemented using this approach can be interpreted as the approximate percent change in price for each one unit change in the predictor variable (in this case, one corrective statement).

Estimates of the Parameters of a Poisson Regression Equation Predicting The L-W Weighted Decision of Whether Respondents Said They Would Purchase the Dog Food Using the Number of Corrective Statements Seen, Gender, Age, Education, the “Concern for dog” Index, and the “Purchase of non-GMO / Organic” Index

Predictor	Unstandardized Regression Coefficient	p-value
Number of corrective statements	-.11	.09
Gender (female = 1)	-.45	.02
Gender (missing = 1)	-15.39	.00
Age (age 30 - 44 = 1)	-.47	.05
Age (age 45 - 59 = 1)	-.83	.01
Age (age 60 or older = 1)	-.89	.00
Education (HS graduate or equivalent = 1)	-.89	.02
Education (Some college = 1)	-.57	.09
Education (Bachelor's degree or more = 1)	-.50	.13
Concern for dog (1 = higher index score)	.81	.09
Missing concern for dog index (1 = missing)	.55	.74

Predictor	Unstandardized Regression Coefficient	p-value
Purchase of non-GMO / organic (1 = higher index score)	.41	.08
Missing purchase of non-GMO/organic index (1 = missing)	.49	.37
Constant	3.94	.00
N	5,808	

36. By using the nlcom command in Stata, this regression estimates the predicted decrease in value resulting from seeing each additional corrective statement, coded to range from 0 to 8. The next table shows the impact of the number of corrective statements on the value attached to the product.

Percent Decrease in the Value of the Product with Increasing Numbers of Corrective Statements

Number of Corrective Statements	Percent Decrease in Value	Standard Error	z	p-value
1	-10.7%	6.0%	-1.77	.08
2	-20.3%	10.8%	-1.88	.06
3	-28.8%	14.4%	-2.00	.05
4	-36.4%	17.2%	-2.12	.03
5	-43.3%	19.2%	-2.25	.02
6	-49.3%	20.6%	-2.40	.02
7	-54.8%	21.4%	-2.56	.01
8	-59.6%	21.9%	-2.73	.01

Impact of the Corrective Statements on Evaluations of the Product

37. Of the 6,728 respondents who completed the questionnaire, 8 did not answer either of the two questions measuring perceived quality and healthiness of the product. Therefore, a total of 6,720 respondents contributed data to the analyses described next.

38. These two questions were:

- *QUALITY. How would you rate the quality of this dog food? Excellent, good, fair, poor, or very poor?*
- *HEALTHY. How healthy would you say this dog food is? Extremely healthy, very healthy, moderately healthy, slightly healthy, or not healthy at all?*

39. Responses to these two questions were transformed to quantities as follows:


- Excellent / Extremely healthy = 100
- Good / Very = 75
- Fair / Moderately = 50
- Poor / Slightly = 25
- Very Poor / Not healthy at all = 0

40. These quantities were then averaged to yield an index. If a respondent was missing a value on either quantity, the other quantity was used. Then, the parameters of an ordinary least squares regression were estimated, predicting the index using the number of corrective statements seen, controlling for the “Concern for dog” index, the “Purchase of non-GMO / organic” index, a dummy variable for each index that indicated the respondent did not answer any of the questions in the index, and dummy variables representing four demographic control variables (gender, age, education, and income). The impact of the number of statements viewed was significant and negative, indicating that the more corrective statements respondents read, the more poorly they evaluated the product. This is illustrated in the regression coefficients and graph that follow.

Estimates of the Parameters of an OLS Regression Equation Predicting Evaluations of the Dog Food Using the Number of Corrective Statements Seen, Gender, Age, Education, Income, the “Concern for dog” Index, and the “Purchase of non-GMO / Organic” Index

Predictor	Unstandardized Regression Coefficient	p-value
Number of corrective statements	-3.02	.00

Gender (female = 1)	-6.78	.00
Gender (missing = 1)	-8.45	.68
Age (age 30 - 44 = 1)	-.47	.78
Age (age 45 - 59 = 1)	-6.90	.00
Age (age 60 or older = 1)	-10.14	.00
Education (HS graduate or equivalent = 1)	-.57	.84
Education (Some college = 1)	1.84	.49
Education (Bachelor's degree or more = 1)	6.45	.02
Income (missing = 1)	-.06	.98
Income (1 = \$30,000 to \$59,999)	3.64	.03
Income (1 = \$60,000 to \$99,999)	4.07	.02
Income (1 = \$100,000 or more)	6.93	.00
Concern for dog (1 = higher index score)	.42	.88
Missing concern for dog index (1 = missing)	2.41	.57
Purchase of non-GMO / organic (1 = higher index score)	1.65	.22
Missing purchase of non-GMO/organic index (1 = missing)	27.07	.13
Constant	63.27	.00
<hr/>		
N	6,720	
R ²	.09	
<hr/>		



Results: Impact of Potential Indicator of Response Inaccuracy

41. The length of time respondents took to complete the online questionnaire was examined as a potential indicator of response inaccuracy. The time respondents spent on each screen of the questionnaire was recorded. The median elapsed time between opening and submitting the questionnaire was approximately 16 minutes. Completing the questionnaire very quickly or slowly may indicate inaccuracies in a respondent's data.
42. Answering questions quickly may indicate that a respondent did not read completely or did not think much about the questions. Taking a long time to complete the questionnaire may indicate that a respondent was temporarily interrupted, which could attenuate any effects of the corrective information.
43. The majority of respondents completed the questionnaire in 10 to 30 minutes. Fewer than 3% of respondents completed the questionnaire in less than five minutes, and fewer than 3% of respondents spent 55 minutes or more completing the questionnaire. As shown in the next

table, these numbers are so small as to indicate there is no substantial risk that very quick or very slow completion compromised the accuracy of the results reported thus far.¹⁰

Distribution of Time Spent Completing the Questionnaire¹¹

Number of Minutes	Percent of Respondents	Cumulative Percent of Respondents
Less than 5 minutes	2.3%	2.3%
5 to less than 10 minutes	16.1%	18.3%
10 to less than 15 minutes	26.5%	44.9%
15 to less than 20 minutes	21.6%	66.5%
20 to less than 30 minutes	21.1%	87.6%
30 to less than 55 minutes	9.5%	97.1%
55 minutes or more	2.9%	100.0%
N	6,728	

Effects of Corrective Statements in Subgroups

44. The expected effects of number of corrective statements on value and perceived quality and healthiness of the foods was apparent in a variety of subgroups of the respondents, indicating generality of the finding observed with all respondents.
45. Throughout this section, the questions used in these analyses are described. In all cases, a dummy variable for each characteristic was generated to create two categories, with respondents who had the attribute of interest coded 1 and all other respondents (including respondents who were missing on the variable) coded 0.
46. First, the effect was examined among respondents with various characteristics related to dog ownership, including:
 - Respondents who reported owning a relatively larger number of dogs since they were 18 years old (i.e., more than two dogs)

¹⁰ SurveyGizmo recorded the total time between start and finish and the time spent on each screen of the questionnaire. Thirty-three respondents did not have a total time elapsed. Because total time elapsed and the sum of the time spent on each screen of the survey were nearly perfectly correlated (Pearson's $r = .9974$), the sum of the time spent on each screen of the survey was used for these 33 respondents in the categorization of time spent completing the questionnaire.

¹¹ The numbers in this table are unweighted.

- Respondents who reported owning dogs during the class period (i.e., owned one or more dogs since the start of the class period - July 1, 2013)
- Respondents who reported spending a relatively large amount of money on food per dog (i.e., spent more than \$1.28 per month, per pound, per dog on average)
- Respondents who said they bought pet food at a store that sells only pet supplies

47. Dummy variables were generated to represent these subgroups. The first question analyzed was the number of dogs owned as an adult:

- *DOG_NUM. What is the total number of dogs you have owned since you were 18 years old?*

48. Next respondents indicated if they owned dogs during the class period by answering one of four questions, depending on prior answers to other questions in the questionnaire:

- *DOG_CURR. Do you own that dog now, or do you not own it now?*
- *DOGS_CURR. Do you own one of those dogs now, or do you not own any of those dogs now?*
- *DOG_CLASS. Did you own that dog before July 1, 2013, or did you not own it then?*
- *DOGS_CLASS. Did you own any of those dogs before July 1, 2013, or did you not own any of them then?*

49. A computation of the amount of money spent per pound of dog was created by first averaging across responses to three questions to determine the average weight, in pounds, of the dogs owned by respondents¹²:

- *WEIGHT1A. In the box below, please type how many pounds your dog has weighed, on average, during the time you have owned it.*
- *WEIGHT1B. In the box below, please type how many pounds your dog weighed, on average, during the time you have owned it.*

¹² Respondents provided open ended text responses, and some were non-numeric answers, which were converted to numbers for analysis. For instance, respondents who provided a range (i.e., 10-15) were assigned the midpoint of the range. If respondents typed a quantity in words (i.e., “twenty”), this was coded as the number (20). If respondents entered a value plus text that indicated it was a minimum but with no upper point for a range (i.e., 6+), the respondent was assigned the number (6). Responses that did not describe a number (e.g. “don’t know”, “not sure”, “adjusting”) were recoded to missing. One respondent typed “55,00”; this response was recoded to 55.

- *WEIGHTX. In the boxes below, please type how many pounds each of your dogs weighed, on average, during the time you have owned it.*¹³
50. To measure the amount of money spent on dog food per month, on average, respondents were asked one of two questions, depending on how many dogs they had owned:
- *DOG_FOODSPEND. During the time when you have owned a dog, how much money did you spend for your dog's food per month, on average?*
 - *DOGS_FOODSPEND. During the time when you have owned dogs, how much money did you spend for your dogs' food per month, on average?*
51. The weight and food spend variables were winsorized, which means that outlying values were recoded to the highest or lowest value in the distribution. This was done by identifying all values that were three standard deviations above or below the mean, setting those variables to missing, then recoding them to the highest or lowest non-outlying value.
52. Finally, the average amount of money spent on dogs per month was divided by the average weight of the dog(s) respondents owned to compute the average amount of money spent per pound per month. This average was winsorized as described previously. A new variable was created to indicate whether a respondent spent more or less on pet food.
53. Whether respondents ever bought dog in a pet food store was measured with this question:
- *FOOD_PETSTORE. Did you ever buy dog food from a store that sells only pet supplies, or did you never do that?*
54. To test the effect of the number of corrective messages on the purchase decision and product evaluation within different subgroups, a series of OLS regressions were estimated predicting the variable of interest from the demographic controls previously (for purchase decisions: gender, age and education; for product evaluations: these three variables plus income). When a subgroup indicator was perfectly collinear with one or more of the demographic control variables, the demographic control variable was eliminated from the model.
55. The next two tables show the effect of the corrective statements on purchasing decisions was statistically significant and negative in all of the subgroups of respondents examined. The final column in the tables indicate there were no statistically significant differences in the strength of the effect in the categories that are shaded similar colors in the table.

¹³ This question was repeated, displaying the appropriate number of boxes for the number of dogs reported. A maximum of 20 boxes were displayed.

Effect of the Number of Corrective Statements on Purchasing Decisions in Population Subgroups (controlling for Gender, Age, Education, the “Concern for dog” index, and the “Purchase of non-GMO / organic” index)

Subgroup	N	Effect of Number of Corrective Statements	t	p-value	Significant Difference in Effect Between Categories?
Owned more than two dogs	3,304	-.01	-2.23	.03	No
Did not own more than two dogs	2,618	-.02	-2.84	.00	
Owned dogs during the class period	4,243	-.02	-2.48	.01	No
Did not own dogs during the class period	1,679	-.02	-2.73	.01	
Spent more money on dog food	2,876	-.02	-2.54	.01	No
Did not spend more on dog food	3,046	-.02	-2.46	.01	
Bought dog food from a pet store	4,217	-.02	-2.56	.01	No
Did not buy dog food from a pet store	1,705	-.02	-2.54	.01	

Effect of the Number of Corrective Statements on Evaluations of the Dog Food in Population Subgroups (Controlling for Gender, Age, Education, Income, the “Concern for dog” index, and the “Purchase of non-GMO / organic” index)

Subgroup	N	Effect of Number of Corrective Statements	t	p-value	Significant Difference in Effect Between Categories?
Owned more than two dogs	3,304	-2.79	-4.92	.00	No
Did not own more than two dogs	3,413	-3.25	-6.15	.00	

Subgroup	N	Effect of Number of Corrective Statements	t	p-value	Significant Difference in Effect Between Categories?
Owned dogs during the class period	4,243	-2.90	-5.81	.00	No
Did not own dogs during the class period	2,474	-3.23	-5.27	.00	
Spent more money on dog food	2,876	-2.53	-3.97	.00	No
Did not spend more on dog food	3,841	-3.38	-6.97	.00	
Bought dog food from a pet store	4,217	-2.93	-5.84	.00	No
Did not buy dog food from a pet store	2,500	-3.17	-5.15	.00	

56. Next, the effects of corrective statements on value and perceptions of the foods were examined among respondents who:

- Completed the questionnaire earlier in the field period (i.e., before March 24th)
- Took longer to complete the questionnaire (i.e., 15 or more minutes or more)

57. The date the respondent submitted the survey and the time they took to complete it were recorded in SurveyGizmo. These variables were recoded such that respondents who completed earlier were coded 1 and all other respondents were coded 0 for one variable and respondents who took 15 or more minutes to complete the questionnaire were coded 1 and all other respondents were coded 0.

58. As the next table shows, the effect of corrective statements was again negative and statistically significant in all subgroups, as expected.

Effect of the Number of Corrective Statements on Purchasing Decisions Among Respondents Who Completed the Questionnaire Early or Slowly (Controlling for Gender, Age, Education, the “Concern for dog” Index, and the “Purchase of non-GMO / organic” Index

Subgroup	N	Effect of Number of Corrective Statements	t	p-value	Significant Difference in Effect Between Categories?
Completed the questionnaire earlier in the field period	3,210	-.02	-2.67	.01	No
Did not complete the questionnaire earlier in the field period	2,712	-.02	-2.36	.02	
Took longer to complete the questionnaire	3,531	-.01	-2.36	.02	No
Did not take longer to complete the questionnaire	2,390	-.02	-2.62	.01	

Effect of the Number of Corrective Statements on Evaluations of the Dog Food Among Respondents Who Completed the Questionnaire Early or Slowly (Controlling for Gender, Age, Education, Income, the “Concern for dog” Index, and the “Purchase of non-GMO / organic” Index

Subgroup	N	Effect of Number of Corrective Statements	t	p-value	Significant Difference in Effect Between Categories?
Completed the questionnaire earlier in the field period	3,616	-2.85	-5.39	.00	No
Did not complete the questionnaire earlier in the field period	3,101	-3.23	-5.67	.00	
Took longer to complete the questionnaire	3,680	-3.02	-5.54	.00	No
Did not take longer to complete the questionnaire	3,037	-2.95	-5.44	.00	

59. Next, the effects of corrective statements on value and perceptions of the foods were examined among respondents in various demographic subgroups:

- Respondents who were female vs. all other respondents
- Respondents who were more educated (i.e., had a B.A. degree or higher) vs. all other respondents
- Respondents who had higher household incomes (those who reported 2018 household incomes of \$60,000 or more) vs. all other respondents
- Respondents who were married vs. all other respondents
- Respondents who were older (aged 45 or more) vs. all other respondents
- Respondents who lived in HHs by themselves or with one other person vs. all other respondents.
- Respondents who lived in HHs with at least one child under age 18 vs. all other respondents.
- Respondents who lived in households that had only cellular telephone service vs. all other respondents.
- Respondents who lived in one-family detached homes vs. all other respondents.
- Respondents who lived in household where someone owned or was buying the house with a mortgage or loan.
- Respondents who lived in the Northeast or Midwest vs. all other respondents.
- Respondents who were working as a paid employee vs. all other respondents.
- White, non-Hispanic respondents vs. all other respondents.

60. Gender and marital status were measured with the following questions:

- *SEX. What is your sex? (Response options: Male, Female)*
- *MARITAL. Are you now married, widowed, divorced, separated, or never married?*

61. Income was also measured in this survey. First, respondents were asked:

- *QINCOME1. The next question is about your family income. This includes income from jobs, pensions, social security, interest, child support, dividends, profits from businesses or farms, or any other sources of income.*

If you live alone, your family income is just your total income. If you live with other family members, your family income includes your total income plus the incomes of any of the family members who live with you.

During 2018, what was your total family income, before taxes?

Type in the number for the answer

62. If respondents entered an income, amount, it was verified:

- *QINCOME1_CHECK. Just to be sure our computer is recording your answer correctly, did you mean to type that your total family income in 2018 before taxes was [INSERT THE AMOUNT LISTED IN QINCOME1], or was it a different number?*

63. If respondents did not type in their income, a series of questions were asked to determine in what category their incomes fell. Skip patterns were optimized so that respondents only saw questions that were relevant based on their previous answers. See Appendix B for more detail.

- *QINCOME2A. Was it \$40,000 or more in 2018?*
- *QINCOME2B. Was it \$50,000 or more?*
- *QINCOME2C. Was it \$60,000 or more?*
- *QINCOME2D. Was it \$75,000 or more?*
- *QINCOME2E. Was it \$100,000 or more?*
- *QINCOME2F. Was it \$150,000 or more?*
- *QINCOME2G. Was it \$5,000 or more?*
- *QINCOME2H. Was it \$10,000 or more?*
- *QINCOME2J. Was it \$20,000 or more?*
- *QINCOME2K. Was it \$25,000 or more?*
- *QINCOME2L. Was it \$30,000 or more?*

64. These questions were combined to generate an income estimate for each person and recoded so that respondents who reported a household income of \$60,000 or more were coded 1 and all others were coded 0.
65. For the remaining questions in this section, NORC provided data from their routine panel screening instruments so the questions were not asked in this survey.
66. As the next table shows, the effect of corrective statements was negative and statistically significant or nearly so in 21 of these 26 subgroups.

The Effect of the Corrective Statements on Purchasing Decisions in Various Demographic Subgroups, Controlling for Gender, Age, Education, the “Concern for dog” Index, and the “Purchase of non-GMO / organic” Index

Subgroup	N	Effect of Number of Corrective Statements	t	p-value	Significant Difference Between Categories?
Female	3,056	-.01	-2.01	.04	No
Not Female	2,866	-.02	-2.95	.00	
More education (Have a B.A. or more)	1,815	-.02	-2.43	.02	No
Did not have a B.A. or more	4,107	-.02	-2.75	.01	
Higher household income (over \$60,000 in 2018)	2,497	-.03	-3.82	.00	No
Household income not over \$60,000 in 2018	3,425	-.01	-1.44	.15	
Married	3,203	-.02	-3.08	.00	No
Not married	2,719	-.01	-1.90	.06	
Older respondents (over age 45)	3,278	-.02	-2.98	.00	No
Respondents who were not over 45 years old	2,644	-.02	-2.14	.03	
Household size is one or two	2,901	-.01	-1.52	.13	No
Household size is not one or two	3,021	-.02	-3.41	.00	
Household has at least one child	1,820	-.02	-2.24	.02	

Subgroup	N	Effect of Number of Corrective Statements	t	p-value	Significant Difference Between Categories?
Household does not have at least one child	4,102	-.02	-2.80	.01	No
Household has cell phone service only	3,171	-.01	-1.94	.05	No
Household does not have cell phone service only	2,750	-.02	-3.21	.00	
Household is a one family detached home	4,121	-.02	-3.46	.00	No
Household is not a one family detached home	1,801	-.01	-1.35	.18	
Someone in household owns or is buying the home with a mortgage	4,173	-.02	-3.65	.00	No
No one in household owns or is buying the home with a mortgage	1,749	-.01	-1.17	.24	
Respondent lives in Northeast or Midwest	2,204	-.02	-2.80	.01	No
Respondent does not live in Northeast or Midwest	3,718	-.02	-2.40	.02	
Respondent is working as a paid employee	3,268	-.02	-3.26	.00	No
Respondent is not working as a paid employee	2,654	-.01	-1.49	.14	
Respondent is white and non-Hispanic	3,876	-.02	-3.32	.00	No
Respondent is not white and non-Hispanic	2,046	-.02	-1.85	.06	

The Effect of the Number of Corrective Statements on Evaluations of the Dog Food in Demographic Subgroup, Controlling for Gender, Age, Education, Income, the “Concern for dog” Index, and the “Purchase of non-GMO / organic” Index

Subgroup	N	Effect of Number of Corrective Statements	t	p-value	Significant Difference Between Categories?
Female	3,464	-3.24	-5.92	.00	No
Not Female	3,253	-2.76	-5.05	.00	
More education (Have a B.A. or more)	2,168	-3.56	-6.98	.00	No
Did not have a B.A. or more	4,549	-2.77	-5.33	.00	
Higher household income (over \$60,000 in 2018)	2,856	-3.38	-6.69	.00	No
Household income not over \$60,000 in 2018	3,861	-2.76	-4.88	.00	
Married	3,529	-3.19	-5.80	.00	No
Not married	3,188	-2.85	-5.18	.00	
Older respondents (over age 45)	3,621	-3.00	-5.62	.00	No
Respondents who were not over 45 years old	3,096	-3.05	-5.37	.00	
Household size is one or two	3,297	-2.69	-4.63	.00	No
Household size is not one or two	3,420	-3.31	-6.35	.00	
Household has at least one child	2,036	-2.77	-3.80	.00	No
Household does not have at least one child	4,681	-3.15	-6.88	.00	
Household has cell phone service only	3,591	-3.13	-5.85	.00	No
Household does not have cell phone service only	3,126	-2.88	-5.11	.00	

Subgroup	N	Effect of Number of Corrective Statements	t	p-value	Significant Difference Between Categories?
Household is a one family detached home	4,535	-3.21	-7.03	.00	No
Household is not a one family detached home	2,182	-2.63	-3.58	.00	
Someone in household owns or is buying the home with a mortgage	4,629	-3.08	-6.74	.00	No
No one in household owns or is buying the home with a mortgage	2,088	-2.89	-3.93	.00	
Respondent lives in Northeast or Midwest	2,591	-2.18	-3.65	.00	No
Respondent does not live in Northeast or Midwest	4,126	-3.53	-7.05	.00	
Respondent is working as a paid employee	3,725	-2.64	-5.29	.00	No
Respondent is not working as a paid employee	2,992	-3.46	-5.66	.00	
Respondent is white and non-Hispanic	4,268	-3.40	-7.32	.00	No
Respondent is not white and non-Hispanic	2,449	-2.43	-3.58	.00	

References

- Callegaro, M. & DiSogra, C. (2008). Computing Response Metrics for Online Panels, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 72. 5. Pp 1008 to 1032 <https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfn065>.
- DeBell, M., Krosnick, J.A., Lupia, A. & Roberts, C. (2009). User's Guide to the Advance Release of the 2008-2009 ANES Panel Study. Palo Alto, CA and Ann Arbor, MI: Stanford University and University of Michigan.
- Lewbel, A. 2000. "Semiparametric qualitative response model estimation with unknown heteroscedasticity or instrumental variables." Journal of Econometrics, 97, 145-177.
- Watanabe, M. 2010. "Nonparametric estimation of mean willingness to pay from discrete response valuation data." American Journal of Agricultural Economics, 92, 1114-1135.

Appendix A:
Curriculum Vita of Jon Krosnick

Jon A. Krosnick

Home Address 10 La Sandra Way
Portola Valley, California 94028
(650) 851-9143

Office Address 434 McClatchy Hall
Stanford University
450 Serra Mall
Stanford, California 94305
(650) 725-3031

E-mail: Krosnick@stanford.edu
Fax: (650) 725-2472

Websites <http://www.jonkrosnick.com>
<http://communication.stanford.edu/faculty/krosnick.html>
<http://www.stanford.edu/group/polisci/faculty/krosnick.html>
<http://climatepublicopinion.stanford.edu/>
<https://pprg.stanford.edu/>
<http://bps.stanford.edu/>
<http://sipp.stanford.edu/>

Education The Lawrenceville School, with academic distinction, 1976.

A.B., Harvard University (in Psychology, Magna Cum Laude), 1980.

M.A., University of Michigan (in Social Psychology, with Honors), 1983.

Ph.D., University of Michigan (in Social Psychology), 1986.

Employment

2017-	Affiliated Faculty Member, Emmett Interdisciplinary Program in Environment and Resources, Stanford University.
2015-	Research Advisor, Gallup, Princeton, New Jersey.
2015-	Affiliate, Woods Institute for the Environment, Stanford University.
2014-2016	Affiliated Faculty Member, Meta-Research Innovation Center at Stanford (METRICS), Stanford University.
2013-2014	Visiting Research Collaborator, Princeton Institute for International and Regional Studies and the Princeton Environmental Institute, Princeton University.
2010-	Research Psychologist, Center for Survey Measurement, U.S. Census Bureau, United States Department of Commerce.

2009-2010	Research Psychologist, Statistical Research Division, U.S. Census Bureau, United States Department of Commerce.
2006-	Research Professor, Survey Research Laboratory, University of Illinois.
2005-2011	Co-Principal Investigator, American National Election Studies.
2004-	Frederic O. Glover Professor in Humanities and Social Sciences, Stanford University.
2004-	Professor, Department of Communication, Stanford University.
2004-	Professor, Department of Political Science, Stanford University.
2004-	Professor, Department of Psychology (by courtesy), Stanford University.
2004-2008	Associate Director, Institute for Research in the Social Sciences, Stanford University.
2008-2014	Senior Fellow, Woods Institute for the Environment (by courtesy), Stanford University.
2005-2008	Senior Fellow, Woods Institute for the Environment, Stanford University.
2004-2007	Director, Methods of Analysis Program in the Social Sciences, Stanford University.
2004-2006	Visiting Professor, Department of Psychology, The Ohio State University.
2003-2004	Visiting Professor, Department of Communication, Stanford University.
1986-2004	Assistant to Associate to Full Professor, Departments of Psychology and Political Science, The Ohio State University.
1987-1989	Adjunct Research Investigator, Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
1987-1989	Lecturer, Survey Research Center Summer Program in Survey Research Techniques, University of Michigan.
1986-1987	Visiting Scholar, Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
1985	Lecturer, Department of Psychology, The Ohio State University.
1982-1985	Research Assistant, Center for Political Studies and Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
1980-1981	Senior Research Assistant, Department of Psychology, Harvard University.
1979-1981	Senior Research Assistant, Department of Behavioral Sciences, School of Public Health, Harvard University.
1975-1976	General Manager, The Lawrence (newspaper), The Lawrenceville School.

Honors

1976	Bausch and Lomb Science Award.
1982	National Institute of Mental Health Graduate Training Fellowship.
1984	Phillip Brickman Memorial Prize for Research in Social Psychology.
1984	American Association for Public Opinion Research Student Paper Award.
1984	National Institute of Mental Health Graduate Training Fellowship.
1984	Pi Sigma Alpha Award for the Best Paper Presented at the 1983 Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting.
1984	Elected Departmental Associate, Department of Psychology, University of Michigan, recognizing outstanding academic achievement.
1990	Invited Guest Editor, Social Cognition (Special issue on political psychology, Vol. 8, #1, May)
1993	Brittingham Visiting Scholar, University of Wisconsin.
1995	Erik H. Erikson Early Career Award for Excellence and Creativity in the Field of Political Psychology, International Society of Political Psychology.
1996-1997	Fellow, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, California.
1998	Elected Fellow, American Psychological Association.
1998	Elected Fellow, Society for Personality and Social Psychology.
1998	Elected Fellow, American Psychological Society.
2001-	Appointed University Fellow, Resources for the Future, Washington, DC.
2003	Prize for the Best Paper Presented at the 2002 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Section on Elections, Public Opinion, and Voting Behavior.
2009	Elected Fellow, American Academy of Arts and Sciences.
2010	Elected Fellow, American Association for the Advancement of Science.
2013-2014	Fellow, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, California.
2014	The AAPOR Award, the American Association for Public Opinion Research's lifetime achievement award, given for an outstanding contribution to the field of public opinion research, including: advances in theory, empirical research and methods; improvements in ethical standards; and promotion of understanding among the public, media and/or policy makers.
2014-2015	Consulting Scholar, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, California.

- 2016 The Nevitt Sanford Award from the International Society of Political Psychology, for professional contributions to political psychology, given to someone engaged in the practical application of political psychological principles or creating knowledge that is accessible and used by practitioners to make a positive difference in the way politics is carried out.

Invited Addresses

- 1992 Invited Address, Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- 2003 Invited Address, Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- 2004 Invited Address, Distinguished Lecture Series Sponsored by the Departments of Psychology and Political Science, University of California, Davis, California.
- 2004 Keynote Lecture, International Symposium in Honour of Paul Lazarsfeld, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (Belgium).
- 2005 Invited Address, Joint Program in Survey Methodology Distinguished Lecture Series, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland.
- 2005 Invited Address, “Climate Change: Science → Action”, Conference Hosted by the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, Aspen, Colorado.
- 2005 Invited Commentator, “Science for Valuation of EPA’s Ecological Protection Decisions and Programs,” a U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Science Advisory Board Workshop, Washington, DC.
- 2006 Invited Address, “The Wonderful Willem Saris and his Contributions to the Social Sciences.” Farewell Symposium for Willem Saris, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands.
- 2006 Invited Workshop, “The State of Survey Research.” Annual Summer Meeting of the Society for Political Methodology, Davis, California.
- 2006 Invited Keynote Address, “Recent Lessons Learned About Maximizing Survey Measurement Accuracy in America: One Surprise After Another.” 2006 Survey Research Methodology Conference, Center for Survey Research, Academia Sinica, Taipei, Taiwan.
- 2006 Invited Address, “Review of Nonresponse Analysis Across Multiple Surveys.” Conference on “Sample Representativeness: Implications for Administering and Testing Stated Preference Surveys,” Resources for the Future, Washington, D.C.
- 2006 Invited Address, “Introduction to Survey Issues in Ecological Valuation.” Meeting of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Scientific Advisory Board Committee on Valuing the Protection of Ecological Systems and Services (CVPESS), Washington, D.C.
- 2006 Invited Address, “Gas Pumps and Voting Booths: Energy and Environment in the Midterm Elections.” First Wednesday Seminar, Resources for the Future, Washington, D.C.
- 2006 Invited Address, “What Americans Believe and Don’t Believe about Global Warming: Attitude Formation and Change in Response to a Raging Scientific Controversy.” National Science Foundation Speaker Series, Washington, D.C.

- 2006 Invited Address, “Moving Survey Data Collection to the Internet? Surprising Ways that Mode, Sample Design and Response Rates Affect Survey Accuracy.” New York Chapter of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, Fordham University, New York, New York.
- 2006 Invited Address, “Climate change: What Americans Really Think.” Conference entitled “A Favorable Climate for Climate Action,” sponsored by the Sustainable Silicon Valley, Santa Clara University, Santa Clara, California.
- 2006 Invited Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change: Attitude Formation and Change in Response to a Raging Scientific Controversy.” Brown Bag Series, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Silver Spring, Maryland.
- 2007 Invited Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change: Attitude Formation and Change in Response to a Raging Scientific Controversy.” Education And Outreach Colloquium, Earth Sciences Division, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland.
- 2007 Inaugural Lecture, “The Brave New World of Survey Research: One Surprise After Another.” Survey Research Institute First Annual Speaker Series, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.
- 2007 Inaugural Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change: Attitude Formation and Change in Response to a Raging Scientific Controversy.” National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science/Center for Sponsored Coastal Ocean Research Ecosystem Science Seminar Series & NOS Science Seminar Series, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Silver Spring, Maryland.
- 2007 Plenary Speaker, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change: Attitude Formation and Change in Response to a Raging Scientific Controversy.” Annual Ocean and Coastal Program Managers’ Meeting, Sponsored by the Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management in partnership with the National Estuarine Research Reserve Association, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Washington, DC.
- 2007 Oral Testimony on Assembly Bill 372 (to revise the order in which the names of candidates for an office must appear on the ballot) before the Nevada State Legislature, Carson City, Nevada.
- 2007 Invited Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change: Attitude Formation and Change in Response to a Raging Scientific Controversy.” The White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, Washington, D.C.
- 2007 Invited Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change: Attitude Formation and Change in Response to a Raging Scientific Controversy.” Workshop on Climate Science and Services: Coastal Applications for Decision Making through Sea Grant Extension and Outreach. NOAA Coastal Services Center, Charleston, South Carolina.
- 2007 Invited Lecture, “Climate Change: What Americans Think.” Capitol Hill briefing sponsored by the Environment and Energy Study Institute, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C. Broadcast live on C-SPAN.
- 2007 Invited Lecture, “The Impact of Candidate Name Order on Election Outcomes.” The Carter Center, Atlanta, Georgia.

- 2007 Invited Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change: Attitude Formation and Change in Response to a Raging Scientific Controversy.” Google, Mountain View, California.
- 2007 Invited Lecture, “Climate Change: What Americans Really Think.” The Commonwealth Club, San Francisco, California.
- 2007 Invited Address, “Representativeness of Online Panels.” Time-Warner 2007 Research Conference, New York, New York.
- 2007 Invited Lecture, “What the Public Knows.” News Executives Roundtable: Covering Climate Change, Stanford, California.
- 2007 Invited Address, “The Top Ten Signs of an Excellent Survey Vendor.” Intuit Corporate Customer & Market Insight Offsite, Palo Alto, California.
- 2007 Invited Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change.” Association of Science-Technology Centers Conference, Los Angeles, California.
- 2007 Invited Address, “The New American National Election Study Panel Survey Project.” Survey Research in the 21st Century: Challenges and Opportunities, Royal Statistical Society, London, UK.
- 2007 Invited Testimony, “Aviation Safety: Can NASA Do More to Protect the Public?” House Committee on Science and Technology, U.S. Congress, Washington, DC. Broadcast live on C-SPAN.
- 2007 Invited Opening Keynote Address, “New Insights Into Optimizing Survey Questionnaire Design and Selecting a Model of Data Collection.” Panel Research 2007, ESOMAR World Research Conference, Orlando, Florida.
- 2007 Invited Plenary Address, “New Insights into Questionnaire Design: How to Maximize the Validity of Your Measurements.” Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology Research Conference, Arlington, Virginia.
- 2007 Invited Lecture, “What Americans Think and Do About Climate Change; Insights from a Psychological Perspective.” California Institute for Energy and Environment’s Behavior, Energy, and Climate Change Conference, Sacramento, California.
- 2007 Invited Keynote Lecture, “What Americans Think About Climate Change.” 2007 American Public Media Conference on Sustainability, Pocantico Conference Center, Tarrytown, New York.
- 2007 Invited Address, “What the American Public Really Thinks About Climate Change: New Evidence on Amelioration Strategies.” 2007 American Geophysical Union Fall Meeting, San Francisco, California.
- 2008 Invited Address, “Climate Change and the 2008 U.S. Presidential Election.” Eighth National Conference on Science, Policy, and the Environment: Climate Change: Science and Solutions. Conference sponsored by the National Council for Science and the Environment, Washington, DC.
- 2008 Invited Presentation, “Explaining the Relation of Aging with Susceptibility to Attitude Change.” Eighth Annual SPSP Attitudes Preconference, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

- 2008 Invited Lecture, “Comparisons of Survey Modes in Terms of Data Quality.” Department of Families, Housing, Community Services, and Indigenous Affairs, Australian Government, Canberra, Australia.
- 2008 Invited Lecture, “Applying Theories of Attitudes and Attitude Change to the Mission of the Australian Tax Office.” Australian Tax Office, Australian Government, Canberra, Australia.
- 2008 Invited Lecture, “The Theory of Survey Satisficing.” Tourism Australia, Canberra, Australia.
- 2008 Invited Lecture, “Lessons from the Field: A Blueprint for Optimizing Measurement Accuracy and Sample Composition.” 40th Meeting of the Computer Market Analysis Group, Intuit, Mountain View, California.
- 2008 Invited Lecture, “Uses of Surveys in Court.” How to Find, Litigate, and Try Class Action Lawsuits, Educational Symposium sponsored by Consumer Attorneys of San Diego, San Diego, California.
- 2008 Invited Keynote Address, “What the American Public Really Thinks About Climate Change: New Evidence on Amelioration Strategies.” Union of Concerned Scientists Retreat, National Labor College, Silver Spring, Maryland.
- 2008 Invited Lecture, “The Challenges of Measuring Facts Accurately in Surveys: Small Changes in Question Wording can Make a Difference.” Survey Methodology Division, U.S. Census Bureau, Suitland, Maryland.
- 2008 Invited Lecture, “The Accuracy of Non-Probability Samples of People Who Volunteer to Do Surveys for Money.” Harvard Center for Survey Research 2008 Spring Conference: New Technologies and Survey Research, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- 2008 Invited Presentation, “Writing an Effective Grant Proposal for NSF.” AAPOR Professional Development Breakfast. Annual Meeting of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- 2008 Invited Commentary, “Reflections on the American Voter Revisited.” Annual Meeting of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- 2008 Invited Presentation, “Briefing on the NAOMS Survey Creation.” Presentation to the Committee to Assess NASA’s National Aviation Operations Monitoring Service (NAOMS) Project, National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, DC.
- 2008 Invited Address, “Public Attitudes, Perceptions, and Concern about Global Warming: Evidence from a New Survey.” Lecture at the Russell Senate Office Building in the Environmental Science Seminar Series Sponsored by the American Meteorological Society, Washington, D.C.
- 2008 Invited Keynote Address, “Designing Ballots to Prevent Bias: How the Order of Candidate Names Determines Who Was Elected President.” EVT ’08, 2008 Usenix/Accurate Electronic Voting Technology Workshop, San Jose, California.
- 2008 Invited Address, “What Americans Think about Climate Change: Insights from 10 Years of Psychology-Inspired National Surveys Tracking Public Attitudes.” Symposium on the

Psychology of Global Climate Change, American Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts.

- 2008 Invited Presentation, “The Accuracy of On-line Surveys with Non-Probability Samples.” Second Annual Workshop on Measurement and Experimentation with Internet Panels, Sponsored by CentERdata, Institute for Data Collection and Research (University of Tilburg), Zeist, The Netherlands.
- 2008 Invited Address, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change: Is it Happening? What’s Causing it? What Should Be Done About It?” Conference entitled “Social Science and Humanities Facing the Climate Change Challenges,” sponsored by the European Union, the Republic of France, the French Ministère de L’Enseignement Supérieur Et De La Recherche, and the French Ministère De L’Ecologie, De L’Energie, Du Développement Durable, Et De L’Aménagement du Territoire, Paris, France.
- 2008 Invited Presentation, “Susceptibility to Response Effects in Surveys: Cognitive and Motivational Factors.” Seventh International Conference on Social Science Methodology – RC33 – Logic and Methodology in Sociology, Naples, Italy.
- 2008 Invited Presentation, “Satisficing When Answering Questions: A Theoretical Explanation for a Wide Range of Findings in the Questionnaire Design Literature.” Max Planck Institute for Human Development, Berlin, Germany.
- 2008 Invited Presentation, “Social Psychology Under the Microscope: Do Classic Laboratory Experiments Replicate When Participants Are Representative of the General Public Rather Than Convenience Samples of College Students?” Max Planck Institute for Human Development, Berlin, Germany.
- 2008 Fathauer Lecturer, “How Do American Voters Decide? Findings from Fifty Years of Scholarship on Electoral Choice.” Eller College of Management, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona.
- 2008 Invited Presentation, “What Are They Thinking? Information, Persuasion, and the American Public’s Response to Climate Change.” American Politics Research Workshop, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- 2008 Invited Presentation, “The 2008 American Presidential Election: Psychological Insights from the AP-Yahoo News Poll.” Society of Experimental Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Sacramento, California.
- 2008 Invited Presentation, “Election Preview: Polls, Ballots, Fraud, and Misconceptions.” 46th Annual New Horizons in Science Conference, Council for the Advancement of Science Writing, Palo Alto, California.
- 2008 Invited Presentation, “Getting Into the Heads of American Voters: Insights from Political Psychology.” Menlo School, Menlo Park, California.
- 2008 Invited Lecture, “Do We Really Care About Climate Change? Grounding Climate Policy in Psychological Analysis.” The World Bank, Washington, DC.
- 2008 Invited Lecture, “Issue-Focused Passion in America: How and Why Issue Publics Determine Election Outcomes.” Seminario de Investigación en Ciencia Política 2008, *Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México (ITAM)*, Mexico City, Mexico.

- 2009 Invited Presentation, “Accounting for Biases in NAOMS.” Presentation to the Committee to Assess NASA’s National Aviation Operations Monitoring Service (NAOMS) Project, National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences, NASA Ames Conference Center, Moffett Field, California.
- 2009 Presidential Symposium Lecture, “Why the 2008 U.S. Presidential Election Turned Out As It Did: Psychology Peers Into National Survey Data.” Annual Meeting of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Tampa, Florida.
- 2009 Stauffer Colloquium Series Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change: Attitude Formation and Change in Response to a Raging Scientific Controversy.” School of Behavioral and Organizational Sciences, Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, California.
- 2009 RTI Fellow Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change: Psychological Insights from 10 Years of National Surveys.” RTI International, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina.
- 2009 Walter H. Stellner Distinguished Speaker in Marketing, “Social Psychology Under the Microscope: Do Our Classic Experiments Replicate When Participants Are Representative of the General Public Rather Than Convenience Samples of College Students?” College of Business, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, Illinois.
- 2009 Invited Presentation, “Mediation: Why Bother?” Twelfth Sydney Symposium of Social Psychology entitled “Attitudes and Attitude Change.” University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia.
- 2009 Keynote Address, “Money for Surveys: What about Data Quality?” GOR 09, 11th General Online Research Conference, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria.
- 2009 Invited Presentation, “Comparing Various Measures of Survey Accuracy and Summarizing the Findings of Studies Using Each Method.” Conference on Survey Quality, Program on Survey Research, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- 2009 Invited Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change: Attitude Formation and Change in Response to a Raging Scientific Controversy.” Climate Policy Seminar Series, sponsored by the Climate Risk Management Initiative, Dickinson School of Law, the Environment & Natural Resources Institute, the Penn State Institute of Energy and the Environment, the Rock Ethics Institute, Communication Arts and Sciences, Department of Political Science, Department of Psychology, Schreyer Institute for Teaching Excellence, and the Social Science Research Institute, Pennsylvania State University.
- 2009 Invited Lecture, “The Accuracy of Online Surveys with Non-probability Samples of People who Volunteer to do Surveys for Money.” Center for Statistics and the Social Sciences Seminar, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.
- 2009 Allen Edwards Endowed Lecture in Psychology, “Social Psychology Under the Microscope: Do Classic Experiments Replicate when Participates are Representative of the General Public Rather Than Convenience Samples of College Students?” Department of Psychology, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.
- 2009 Invited Lecture, “Why I Challenged the NASA Administrator in Congressional Testimony: The Shocking Story of a Groundbreaking Aviation Safety Survey Research Project Gone Awry.” Google Tech Talk Series, Mountain View, California.

- 2009 Invited Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change: Attitude Formation and Change in Response to a Raging Scientific Controversy.” Climate Central, Princeton, New Jersey.
- 2009 Invited Plenary Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change: Attitude Formation and Change in Response to a Raging Scientific Controversy.” A National Workshop on Communicating Ocean Issues Based on Ocean on the Edge: Top Ocean Issues. Long Beach Convention Center, sponsored by the Aquarium of the Pacific, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the National Research Council’s Marine Board and Ocean Studies Board, Long Beach, California.
- 2009 Invited Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change.” Air Resources Board Chair’s Air Pollution Seminar, California Environmental Protection Agency Building, Sacramento, California.
- 2009 Invited Presentation, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change.” Stanford University Alumni Association – Sacramento Chapter. Sacramento, California.
- 2009 Keynote Address, “The End of Agree/Disagree Rating Scales: Acquiescence Bias and Other Flaws Suggest a Popular Measurement Method Should Be Abandoned.” European Survey Research Association 2009 Conference, Warsaw, Poland.
- 2009 Invited Lecture, “Methods of Survey Data Collection and Determinants of Data Quality.” German Research Foundation Summer Academy on Methods of Educational Research, University of Bamberg, Bamberg, Germany.
- 2009 Invited Panel Member, “Hopenhagen: Public support for a climate deal in Copenhagen.” The Commonwealth Club of California, San Francisco, California.
- 2009 Invited Primary Paper Presentation, “Conducting Experiments to Evaluate Questions.” Workshop on Question Evaluation Methods, National Center for Health Statistics, Hyattsville, Maryland.
- 2009 Invited Presentation, “The Use of Surveys in Court.” Second Annual Class Action Symposium Sponsored by Consumer Attorneys of San Diego, San Diego, California.
- 2009 Invited Presentation, “The Accuracy of Internet Surveys.” Attaining Accuracy, Maximum Coverage, and Representative in Web-Based Research. Conference at the Charles Hotel, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- 2009 Keynote Address, “Scientific Survey Research: Sustainable in an Online World?” CASRO Data Collection Conference, Council of American Survey Research Organizations, Las Vegas, Nevada.
- 2009 Invited Webinar, “Best Practice Data Collection Online with a Probability Sample?” Australian Market & Social Research Society, Sydney, Australia.
- 2010 Invited Presentation, “A New Look at Racism in America: Evidence from National Surveys.” Political Psychology Pre-Conference 2010, Society for Personality and Social Psychology Annual Conference, Las Vegas, Nevada.
- 2010 Invited Presentation, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change: Attitude Formation and Change in Response to a Raging Scientific Controversy.” Stanford Club of Las Vegas, Las Vegas, Nevada.

- 2010 Invited Address, “Tracking American Opinions About Climate Change.” Climate, Mind, and Behavior Symposium, The Garrison Institute, Garrison, New York.
- 2010 Invited Presentation, “Public Opinion and Climate Change: The Real Reason for the Recent Decline.” Climate Policy: Public Perception, Science, and the Political Landscape. Sponsored by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Geophysical Union, the American Meteorological Society, and the American Statistical Association. Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.
- 2010 Invited Lecture, “Creating and Evaluating a new Method for Collecting Survey Data via the Internet: The Story of the FFRISP (Face-to-Face Recruited Internet Survey Platform)”. Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences Lecture Series, National Science Foundation, Arlington, Virginia.
- 2010 Invited Lecture, “Recent Research Findings from SRS Experiments.” Science Resources Statistics Program Colloquium, National Science Foundation, Arlington, Virginia.
- 2010 Invited Lecture, “What Americans Think About Climate Change.” Speaker Series, Center for Decision Sciences, Columbia University, New York, New York.
- 2010 Invited Lecture, “Social Psychology Under the Microscope: Do Our Classic Experiments Replicate When Participants Are Representative of the General Public Rather Than Convenience Samples of College Students?” Colloquium Series, Psychology Department, Columbia University, New York, New York.
- 2010 Invited Lecture, “Public Opinion Research on Climate Change.” Rio Tinto Workshop on the Politics of Carbon, Meridian Institute, Washington, DC.
- 2010 Invited Lecture, “How to Measure Usability: Designing Your Questions Well.” Washington, DC, Chapter of the Usability Professionals’ Association, Arlington, Virginia.
- 2010 Invited Lecture, “Have Americans’ Views on Global Warming Changed? A New Look at Public Opinion.” Briefing sponsored by the Environmental and Energy Study Institute, Capital Visitor Center, Washington, DC.
- 2010 Invited Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change.” Climate Change Communication Forum, Hosted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the U.S. Department of the Interior, George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia.
- 2010 Invited Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change.” Clean Energy Program, Third Way, Washington, DC.
- 2010 Invited Lectures, “Experimental Methods in the Social Sciences.” Workshop in Experimental Methods, Sponsored by the ELECDDEM Training Network in Electoral Democracy, ICHEC, Brussels, Belgium.
- 2010 Invited Lecture, “Optimizing Survey Questionnaire Design: New Findings.” Interagency Response Error Group Monthly Meeting, Government Accountability Office, Washington, DC.
- 2010 Invited Lecture, “Creating and Evaluating a New Method for Collecting Survey Data via the Internet,” Workshop sponsored by DC-AAPOR, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, DC.

- 2010 Keynote Address, “Surveys and Statistical Evidence to Mange the Class Case”. Third Annual Class Action Symposium, San Diego, California.
- 2010 Invited Presentation, “Implicit Attitude Measurement in National Surveys.” Conference on Methodology in Political Psychology, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
- 2010 Invited Presentation, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change,” MZES Colloquium, Mannheimer Zentrum Fur Europaische Sozialforschung, University of Mannheim, Mannheim, Germany.
- 2010 Invited Workshop, “Attitudes in the World of Politics: Formation, Change, and Impact.” Oberrhein-Program (cosponsored by the Universities of Mannheim, Heidelberg, Freiberg, and Basel), Social Sciences Graduate School, University of Mannheim, Mannheim, Germany.
- 2010 Lunchtime Brownbag Series, “Assessing Anti-Black Racism in Contemporary America via Surveys: New Measurement Approaches Yield New Insights.” National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.
- 2010 Invited Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change.” AAAS Leadership Seminar in Science and Technology Policy, American Association for the Advancement of Science, Washington, DC.
- 2010 Invited Panelist, “Outlook for Climate and Energy Policy in the New Congress,” Session in the “Science & Society: Global Challenges Discussion Series”, Center for Science, Technology and Security Policy, American Association for the Advancement of Science, Washington, DC.
- 2010 Invited Guest Speaker, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change.” World Resources Institute, Washington, DC.
- 2010 Invited Presentation to the Working Group on Immigration and Cultural Contact, “The Accuracy of Internet Surveys with Probability and Non-Probability Samples.” Russell Sage Foundation, New York, New York.
- 2010 Invited Lecture, “What Mainers Really Think About Global Warming: Results from an In-Depth Statewide Survey.” Environmental Studies Program, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine.
- 2010 Invited Panelist, “Reflections on the Accomplishments and Future of Political Communication Research.” Conference on “Political Communication: The State of the Field in the 21st Century.” Annenberg Public Policy Center, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- 2010 Invited Presentation, “The American Public’s Understandings and Misunderstandings About Climate Change: Is There a Crisis of Confidence in Climate Science?” Scientific Symposium in Honor of Stephen H. Schneider, Stanford University, Stanford, California.
- 2011 Invited Lecture, “What Floridians Really Think About Global Warming: Results from an In-Depth Statewide Survey.” Lecture hosted by the FSU Department of Earth, Ocean, and Atmospheric Science, the FSU Department of Urban and Regional Planning, the Florida Climate Institute, the Tallahassee Democrat, and the FSU Institute for Energy Systems, Economics, and Sustainability, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida.

- 2011 Invited Presentation, “The Mega-Splice in the 2008 American National Election Studies Time Series Survey.” Design Issues in Longitudinal and Repeated Cross-Sectional Surveys. Duke Initiative on Survey Methodology. Social Science Research Institute at Duke University, Durham, North Carolina.
- 2011 Invited Presentation, “What Americans Think About Global Warming: Attitude Formation and Change in Response to a Raging Scientific Controversy.” Monterey Bay Aquarium, Monterey, California.
- 2011 Invited Testimony, Comments on Assembly Bill No. 99 “Revises the Order in Which the Names of Candidates for an Office Must Appear on the Ballot”, Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections, Nevada Assembly, State of Nevada.
- 2011 Invited Discussant on Respondent Motivation, BLUE-Enterprise and Trade Statistics Conference on Business’ Burden and Motivation in Official Surveys. Conference sponsored by Statistics Netherlands and the European Union, Heerlen, The Netherlands.
- 2011 Invited Presentation, “What Massachusetts Residents and Other Americans Think About Climate Change: Results from an In-Depth Statewide Study and National Surveys.” Boston University, Boston Massachusetts.
- 2011 Invited Presentation, “What Massachusetts Residents and Other Americans Think About Climate Change: Results from an In-Depth Statewide Study and National Surveys.” The Heller School for Social Policy and Management, Brandeis University, Waltham, Massachusetts.
- 2011 Invited Presentation, “What Massachusetts Residents and Other Americans Think About Climate Change: Results from an In-Depth Statewide Study and National Surveys.” Green Conversation Series, Harvard University Center for the Environment, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- 2011 Invited Presentation, “What Massachusetts Residents and Other Americans Think About Climate Change: Results from an In-Depth Statewide Study and National Surveys.” Tufts Institute of the Environment, Tufts University, Medford, Massachusetts.
- 2011 Invited Presentation, “Adventures in Survey Research: A Workshop on the Dangers of Trying to Make the World a Better Place through Social Science.” Essex Short Course in Social Research, in Association with Methodology Institute LSE and IPSOS MORI, University of Essex, Essex, United Kingdom.
- 2011 Invited Presentation, “Measuring Intent to Participate and Participation in the 2010 Census and Their Correlates and Trends: Comparisons of RDD Telephone and Non-probability Sample Internet Survey Data.” U.S. Census Bureau, Suitland, Maryland.
- 2011 Invited Remarks, “Studying the Impact of Electoral Impact of Candidate Statements on Policy Issues.” Session entitled “Studying 2012 Campaign and elections: Current Plans and Future Directions,” sponsored by the Omidyar Network and the National Institute for Civil Discourse at the University of Arizona. American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Seattle, Washington.
- 2011 Invited Presentation, “Social Psychology Under the Microscope: Do Our Classic Experiments Replicate When Participants Are Representative of the General Public Rather

Than Convenience Samples of College Students?” A Conference in Honor of Daniel Wegner, Harvard Business School, Harvard University.

- 2011 Invited Presentation, “American Public Opinion on Climate Change and Its Impact on Voting in Congressional and Presidential Elections.” Public lecture and webcast sponsored by Resources for the Future, Washington, D.C.
- 2011 Invited Webinar, “Advances in Questionnaire Design.” Australian Market & Social Research Society, Sydney, Australia.
- 2011 Invited Lecture, “Passion in American Politics: What Happens When Citizens Become Deeply Committed to Pressuring Government on a Policy Issue.” MZE-Colloquium, School of Social Sciences, University of Mannheim, Mannheim, Germany.
- 2011 Invited Lecture, “Creating the Face-to-Face Recruited Internet Survey Platform (FFRISP).” Collaborative Research Center, University of Mannheim, Mannheim, Germany.
- 2012 Invited Lecture, “Trends in American Public Attitudes about Global Warming: A Psychological Analysis.” Sustainability Psychology Preconference, Society for Personality and Social Psychology Annual Meeting, San Diego, California.
- 2012 Invited Lecture, “Americans’ Views on Climate Change and Their Impact on Voting Behavior.” 2012 Climate, Mind, and Behavior Symposium, Garrison Institute, Garrison, New York.
- 2012 Invited Presentation, “Changing Government Policy by Changing Public Attitudes.” Climate Central, Princeton, New Jersey.
- 2012 Invited Presentation, “Americans’ Views on Climate Change and Their Impact on Voting Behavior.” Skoll Global Threats Fund, San Francisco, California.
- 2012 Invited Presentation, “What Americans Think About Climate Change.” Webinar series on The Science of Policy Communication. Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues.
- 2012 Invited Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change.” Lecture sponsored by the Water Sustainability Program, the Institute of the Environment, the Renewable Energy Network, the School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, and the School of Geography and Development, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona.
- 2012 Invited Lecture, “Trust in Scientists, Controversy Among Scientists, and American Public Opinion on Climate Change: How Attitude Formation and Change Unfold.” Presentation during “The Science of Science Communication”, The Arthur M. Sackler Colloquia, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, DC.
- 2012 Invited Short Course, “Maximizing the Accuracy of Online Surveys: Comparisons of Methods and Recommendations of Optimal Procedures.” American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Orlando, Florida.
- 2012 Invited Lecture, “How Americans Form and Change Their Opinions About Climate Change.” Outside-In Engagement Series sponsored by the Interagency Communication and Education Team, United States Global Change Research Program, Washington, DC.
- 2012 Invited Lecture, “Pursuing Excellence in Scientific Research: Challenges and Rewards.”

Second Annual Stanford University Postdoctoral Association Research Symposium,
Stanford University, Stanford, California.

- 2012 Invited Lecture, “U.S. Public Views on Climate Change: Insights from Polling.” Program on Communicating Uncertainty, Institute for International and Regional Studies, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey.
- 2012 Invited Keynote, “Public perceptions of Climate Change in the U.S.” Planning for Local Government Climate Challenges: Connecting Research and Practice Workshop, Sponsored by the University of Arizona Institute of the Environment, Arizona State University Campus, Tempe, Arizona.
- 2012 Invited Presentation, “Optimizing the Design of Self-Reports.” Engagement and Academic Tenacity: Making the Invisible Salient and Actionable, Workshop Sponsored by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- 2012 Invited Presentation, “Evidence of Decline in Effect Sizes: From Original Studies to Replications to Representative National Samples.” The Decline Effect: Evidence, Explanations, and Future Directions. Symposium at the University of California Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, California.
- 2012 Invited Presentation, “Has the American Public Turned Away from Climate Change?” Salon Sponsored by the Woods Institute for the Environment at Stanford University, Venice, California.
- 2012 Invited Presentation, “Questionnaire Design.” Conference on the Future of Survey Research, National Science Foundation, Arlington, Virginia.
- 2012 Invited Speaker, “What’s at Stake for California?” Event sponsored by the Division of Social Sciences, the Office of Government Relations, and the Politics Department, University of California - Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz, California.
- 2012 Invited Presentation, “Issue Publics and Candidate Evaluations; Contrasting Different Analytic Methods to Identify the Psychological Process of Candidate Evaluation.” Directions in Political Science: Papers in Honor of George B. Rabinowitz. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- 2012 Invited Lecture, “What Americans Think About Climate Change: Explorations of Attitude and Belief Formation and Change in Response to a Raging Controversy”, Lecture Series on Persuasion, Attitude, and Behavior Change, Sponsored by the Research Center for Group Dynamics, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
- 2013 Invited Keynote Address, “The Future of Survey Research,” Survey Research Methodology: The Changing Landscape of Survey Research in the Field and at ICF. Conference sponsored by ICF International, Fairfax, Virginia.
- 2013 Invited Lecture, “The Future of Survey Research,” 2013 National Cancer Institute Division of Cancer Control and Population Sciences Workshop: Global and National Issues Shaping the Cancer Control Surveillance Landscape. NIH Neuroscience Conference Center, Rockville, Maryland.
- 2013 Invited Lecture, “Public Perceptions about Global Warming and Government Involvement in the Issue.” Briefing at the Rayburn House Office Building, sponsored by the Environmental and Energy Study Institute, Washington, DC.

- 2013 Policy Briefing, “Preparing for the Effects of Global Warming: The American Public’s Perspective on Sea Level Rise,” National Press Club, sponsored by the Woods Institute for the Environment at Stanford University and the Center for Ocean Solutions at Stanford University, Washington, DC.
- 2013 Invited Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change - Attitude Formation and Change Across the U.S. in Response to a Raging Scientific Controversy.” Sponsored by the “Middle America” Student Organization, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- 2013 Invited Remarks, “RFF University Fellows Roundtable: RFF’s Next Decade.” Resources for the Future, Washington, DC.
- 2013 Invited Lecture, “The American Public’s Views of Climate Change: An Update.” Department of Global Ecology, Carnegie Institution for Science, Stanford, California.
- 2013 Invited Lecture, “Contingent Valuation.” Lecture sponsored by the Centre for Environmental Political Sciences, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden.
- 2013 Invited Lecture, “The Accuracy of Online Surveys with Non-probability Samples of People who Volunteer to Do Surveys for Money.” Workshop on Survey Methodology, Multidisciplinary Opinion and Democracy Research Group, Department of Political Science, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden.
- 2013 Invited Lecture, “Satisficing When Answering Questions: A Theoretical Explanation for a Wide Range of Findings in the Questionnaire Design Literature.” Workshop on Survey Methodology, Multidisciplinary Opinion and Democracy Research Group, Department of Political Science, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden.
- 2013 Invited Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change: Attitude Formation and Change in Response to a Raging Scientific Controversy.” Sponsored by the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden.
- 2013 Invited Lecture, “Trust in Environmental Scientists and Public Opinion on Global Warming in the United States.” Presentation at the Breakfast Seminar on Climate and Opinion, sponsored by the Bergen Programme for Governance and Climate, Uni Rokkan Center, Bergen, Norway.
- 2013 Invited Lecture, “Survey Item Design.” Workshop on Survey Design for the Norwegian Citizen Panel, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway.
- 2013 Invited Presentation, “American Public Opinion on Climate Change.” Conference on “What is the Value of Being First? Perspectives from the California and Sweden Experiences.” Climate Policy Forum co-sponsored by Resources for the Future, the Swedish Mistra Indigo program, and the ClimateWorks Foundation. Hyatt Regency Embarcadero, San Francisco, California.
- 2013 Invited Lecture, “The Psychology of American Public Opinion on Climate Change.” Symposium on Conservation Psychology, hosted by the University of Southern California Environmental Sustainability Network, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California.
- 2013 Invited Keynote Presentation, “The History of Panel Internet Surveys.” Workshop on

Longitudinal Research in Internet Panels, Program on Political Economy of Reforms, University of Mannheim, Mannheim, Germany.

- 2013 Invited Presentation, “Mode Comparisons.” Workshop on Longitudinal Research in Internet Panels, Program on Political Economy of Reforms, University of Mannheim, Mannheim, Germany.
- 2013 Short Course (with Mario Callegaro), “How to Publish in Survey Research: Strategies, Venues, Opportunities, and Errors to Avoid.” American Association for Public Research Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts.
- 2013 Invited Keynote Address, “The Accuracy of Survey Measurements and the Impact of Data Collection Methodology.” Canadian Political Science Association, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada.
- 2013 Invited Presentation, “Debiasing.” Conference on Risk Communication for Better Long-Term Decisions: Insights from Finance and Healthcare. CenSoC - Centre for the Study of Choice, University of Technology, Sydney, Sydney, Australia.
- 2013 Invited Webinar (with Arthur Lupia and Matthew K. Berent), “Survey Coding: Best Practices for Coding Open-Ended Survey Data.” Webinar sponsored by the American Association for Public Opinion Research.
- 2013 Invited Keynote Address, “The Accuracy of Survey Data Collected by Various American On-line Survey Firms: A 2012 Comparison.” MESS Workshop, Sponsored by the University of Tilburg CentERdata Institute for Data Collection and Research, Den Haag, The Netherlands.
- 2013 Invited Keynote Address, “Social Desirability Response Bias: Real or an Illusion?” Sixth Webdatanet MC, WGs, TFs, Seminars, Webdatametrics Workshop and Conference: “Mixed Mode and Multi-Mode Research.” Sponsored by the Universitatis Islandiae Sigillum, Reykjavik, Iceland.
- 2013 Invited Keynote Address, “Choosing Mode of Data Collection for Surveys to Maximuze Data Quality.” International Conference on Applied Statistics 2013, Ribno, Slovenia.
- 2013 Invited Address, “Online Surveys.” DSA2 Conference on Web Surveys, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia.
- 2013 Invited Address, “The Effects of Scientists’ Expressions of Uncertainty on Public Opinion on Global Warming.” Australian Psychological Society Annual Meeting, Cairns Convention Centre, Queensland, Australia.
- 2013 Invited Presentation, “Inequality in Public Conversations about Politics.” Cottrell Salon, Stanford, California.
- 2013 Invited Webinar, “Communicating About Climate Adaptation with the Public.” Sponsored by the Center for Ocean Solutions and the Woods Institute for the Environment, Stanford University.
- 2013 Invited Testimony, “Public Opinion on Global Warming in the States.” Bicameral Task Force on Climate Change, Committee on Energy and Commerce, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

- 2013 Invited Presentation, “Public Opinion on Global Warming in the States.” Climate Action Campaign, Washington, DC.
- 2013 Invited Short Course, “Maximizing the Accuracy of Online Surveys: Comparisons of Methods and Recommendations of Optimal Procedures.” Annual Meeting of the Pacific Chapter of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, San Francisco, California.
- 2013 Invited Keynote Address, “Public Perceptions of Climate Change in the U.S.” Regional Climate Summit for Municipal Leaders: Economic, Health, Water, and Transportation Impacts. Sponsored by Climate Assessment for the Southwest, University of Arizona. University Marriott, Tucson, Arizona.
- 2014 Invited Presentation, “The Quality of Data Obtained from Non-Probability Internet Panels.” Google, Mountain View, California.
- 2014 Invited Presentation, “Satisficing When Answering Questions: A Theoretical Explanation for a Wide Range of Findings in the Questionnaire Design Literature.” CORE Colloquium Series, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas.
- 2014 Invited Presentation, “Public Opinion on Global Warming.” Connecting the Dots Conference, Sponsored by the Woods Institute for the Environment, Stanford University, Stanford, California.
- 2014 Invited Keynote Address, “The Future of Survey Research.” Survey Research in the 21st Century: Lectures Celebrating the Survey Research Laboratory’s 50th Anniversary, University of Illinois, Champaign, Illinois.
- 2014 Invited Keynote Address, “The Future of Survey Research.” Survey Research in the 21st Century: Lectures Celebrating the Survey Research Laboratory’s 50th Anniversary, University of Illinois, Chicago, Illinois.
- 2014 Invited Webinar, “Experiments in Surveys: Tools for Determining How Marketers Can Shape People’s Preferences.” Australian Market & Social Research Society, Sydney, Australia.
- 2014 Invited Keynote Presentation, “Conducting and Publishing Methodology Research.” Annual Meeting of the Association of Academic Survey Research Organizations, University of Illinois, Chicago, Illinois.
- 2014 Invited Lecture, “Climate Change and Clean Energy – A Survey of U.S. Public Attitudes.” Resources for the Future, Washington, DC.
- 2014 Invited Presentation, “Public Attitudes About Climate Change and Clean Energy.” Sponsored by the Environmental and Energy Study Institute, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.
- 2014 Invited Presentation, “Social Science as Combat: The Global Warming War.” Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Palo Alto, California.
- 2014 Invited Keynote Address, “The Future of Survey Research.” World Association of Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Universidad Diego Portales, Santiago, Chile.
- 2014 Invited Presentation, “American Public Opinion on Global Warming.” S. D. Bechtel, Jr.

Foundation. San Francisco, California.

- 2014 Invited Presentation, “The Future of Survey Research.” IJMR Speaker Evening, Market Research Society, London, U.K.
- 2014 Invited Presentation, “Impact of the Merchants of Doubt and of Natural Scientists on American Public Opinion on Global Warming.” Conference entitled “Responding and Adapting to Climate Change: Recognizing and managing Uncertainty in the Physical, Social, and Public Spheres.” University of Bristol, Bristol, U.K.
- 2014 Invited Presentation, “Comments on Variables that Determine the Quality of Survey Responses.” ESS-DACE Quality Enhancement Meeting Entitled “Measurement Quality in the ESS”. Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, Spain.
- 2014 Invited Presentation, “The Future of Survey Research.” ESS Seminar: Highlights in Survey Research, Campus de la Ciutadella of Universitat Pampeu Fabra, Barcenola, Spain.
- 2014 Invited Presentation “Inequality and Public Opinion on Global Warming.” Institute for the Study of Societal Issues, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, California.
- 2014 Invited Presentation, “The Role of Americans’ Attitudes on Global Warming in Political Campaigns.” Harris School for Public Policy, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.
- 2014 Invited Keynote Address, “Exploring the Origins of Beliefs about Climate Change: Experimental Studies Embedded in National Surveys of the U.S.” The Norwegian Citizen Panel Conference 2014, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway.
- 2015 Invited Keynote Address, “Optimizing the Design of Survey Questionnaires.” Rethink Research: Research Intensification Series, sponsored by the Social Science Research Laboratories, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatchewan, Canada.
- 2015 Invited Presentation, “American Public Opinion on Climate Change: Motivated Cognition?” Harvard University Center for the Environment, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- 2015 Invited Presentation, “Sampling on the Internet for Surveys and Experiments; The Good, the Bad, and he Ugly.” Data Gathering Methods Study Group, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia.
- 2015 Invited Presentation, “Can Surveys Measure Informed Public Preferences Regarding Government Policies? An Evaluation of the Contingent Valuation Method.” Quantitative Collaborative, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia.
- 2015 Invited Presentation, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change: Attitude Formation and Change in Response to a Raging Scientific Controversy.” Center for Survey Research, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia.
- 2015 Invited Presentation, “Causes of Turnout.” Conference entitled “How Voters Think: Lessons from Science and Practice.” A meeting of political scientists with Democratic Party campaign consultants. Harris School of Public Policy, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.
- 2015 Invited Presentation, “Communicating about Climate Change: How Language Choices Affect Public Thinking.” Sunnylands Speaker Series at Rancho Mirage Library, Rancho

Mirage, California.

- 2015 Invited Presentation, “The Impact of Acknowledging Bounded and Unbounded Uncertainty on Persuasion: The Case of Scientific Uncertainty and Global Warming.” Conference entitled “Third Annual UCSB Environmental Political Conference. UCSB Center for Social Solutions to Environmental Problems, Bren School of Environmental Science and Management, University of California, Santa Barbara, California.
- 2015 Invited Presentation, “Fact-Checking and News Literacy.” Annual Journalism Funders Gathering: “Journalism, Democracy, and Political Polarization.” William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, Menlo Park, California.
- 2015 Invited Presentation, “Causes of Turnout.” Conference entitled “How Voters Think: Lessons from Science and Practice.” A meeting of political scientists with Republican Party campaign consultants. Harris School of Public Policy, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.
- 2015 Invited Lecture, “*Social Psychology Under the Microscope: Do Our Classic Experiments Replicate When Participants Are Representative of the General Public Rather Than Convenience Samples of College Students?*” Lecture sponsored by the Quantitative Initiative for Policy and Social Research, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky.
- 2015 Invited Lecture, “*Political Thinking, Passion and Action in America: The Contributions of Jon Krosnick to the Study of Political Psychology.*” Lecture sponsored by the Quantitative Initiative for Policy and Social Research, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky.
- 2015 Invited Presentation, “What Americans Really Think About Global Warming.” Invited Lecture in the Distinguished Speaker Series, Department of Political Science, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia.
- 2015 Invited Remarks, “Samuel Popkin: Celebration of a Remarkable Career.” Institute of the Americas, University of California, San Diego, California.
- 2015 Invited Lecture, “The Influence of the Media.” Academic Department of Political Science, Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México, Mexico City, Mexico.
- 2015 Invited Workshop, “Developments in Survey Research Methodology.” Academic Department of Political Science, Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México, Mexico City, Mexico.
- 2015 Invited Remarks, “Pre-election Polling in the United States.” Foro El Panorama Internacional Sobre El Papel de las Encuestas Electorales. México Instituto Nacional Electoral, Mexico, City, Mexico.
- 2015 Keynote Address, “How Accurate Are Surveys and What Can We Do to Maximize Accuracy.” Annual Conference of the Midwest Association for Public Opinion Research, Chicago, Illinois.
- 2015 Invited Presentation, “What Americans Really Think about Climate Change - Attitude Formation and Change in Response to a Raging Scientific Controversy.” UCCS Speaker Series, University of California Center, Sacramento, California.
- 2015 Invited Presentation, “Reasons to worry about social sciences and opportunities for

- improvement.” Improving Biomedical Research 2015: Challenges and Solutions. Meta-Research Innovation Center at Stanford, Stanford University, Stanford, California.
- 2015 Invited Presentation, “Giving the Public a Voice in the Process of Democratic Policy Making.” Society of Experiment Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Denver, Colorado.
- 2016 Invited Presentation, “The Future of Internet Surveys: Why Bother with Random Sampling?” The Inaugural Ross-Royall Symposium: From Individuals to Populations. Department of Biostatistics, Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.
- 2016 Invited Lecture, “Collapses of Research Integrity and Opportunities to Strengthen Science.” Lecture sponsored by the Office of Research Integrity, University of California, Riverside, Riverside, California.
- 2016 Invited Presentation, “Public Opinion on Climate Change.” Presentation at the California Association of Museums Annual Meeting, Riverside, California.
- 2016 2016 Gierach Lectureship, “Passion in American Politics: What Happens When Citizens Become Deeply Committed to Pressuring Government on a Policy Issue.” Department of Psychology, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.
- 2016 Invited Colloquium, “Best Practices in Science: Profound Problems and Wonderful Opportunities for Psychologists.” Department of Psychology, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.
- 2016 Invited Keynote Address, “Can Surveys Measure Informed Public Preferences Regarding Government Policies? An Evaluation of the Contingent Valuation Method.” Conference on Political Communication, Conflict, Journalism, Public Opinion, Discourse, and Psychological Perspectives. Noah Mozes Department of Communication and Journalism and the Smart Family Institute of Communication, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel.
- 2016 Invited Keynote Address, “Reflections on an Extraordinary Career; Elihu Katz and the Study of Mass Communication and Public Opinion.” Conference on Political Communication, Conflict, Journalism, Public Opinion, Discourse, and Psychological Perspectives. Noah Mozes Department of Communication and Journalism and the Smart Family Institute of Communication, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel.
- 2016 Invited Presentation, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change. Presentation sponsored by the Stanford Alumni Association. Greenberg Traurig Law Firm, Tel Aviv, Israel.
- 2016 Invited Presentation, “Best Practices in Science: Profound Problems and Wonderful Opportunities for Social and Behavioral Scientists.” Department of Communication, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel.
- 2016 Invited Lecture, “The Impact of Survey Mode and Sampling on the Accuracy of Survey Results.” Federal Trade Commission, Washington, DC.
- 2016 Invited Lecture, “Can Surveys Measure Informed Public Preferences Regarding Government Policies? An Evaluation of the Contingent Valuation Method.” GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences, Mannheim, Germany.
- 2016 Invited lecture, “Impact of Survey Modes.” Workshop on Survey Mode Effects, Sponsored

by the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana. Ljubljana, Slovenia.

- 2016 Invited Moderator, “Discussion on Testing for Causal Mediation.” Ninth Annual meeting of the West Coast Experiments Conference, Graduate School of Business, Stanford University, Stanford, California.
- 2016 Invited Comments, “Research Ethics.” Meeting of the DIGSSCORE International Advisory Board, the Norwegian Citizen Panel Scientific Committee, and the Citizen Lab Scientific Committee. University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway.
- 2016 Invited Keynote Address, “The Exciting Opportunities Afforded by Digitalization in the Social and Behavioral Science, and the Need for Academic Research to avoid Disasters.” Kick-off Seminar for the University of Bergen’s Digital Social Science Initiative, Bergen, Norway.
- 2016 Invited Address, “Are Democratic Citizens Capable of Offering Thoughtful Prescriptions on Policy Issues? An Evaluation of the Contingent Valuation Method.” Sciences Po Methods Workshop, CEVIPOF, Centre de Recherches Politiques, Sciences Po, Paris, France.
- 2016 Invited Address, “Issue-focused Passion in American Politics.” Sciences Po Methods Workshop, CEVIPOF, Centre de Recherches Politiques, Sciences Po, Paris, France.
- 2016 Invited Address, “The Polling Blues.” Presentation sponsored by the DC Chapter of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, Washington, DC.
- 2016 Invited Presentation, “Survey Mode, Sampling Methods, and Response Rates.” Deep Water Horizon Total Value – Lessons Learned. Workshop sponsored by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Washington, DC.
- 2016 Invited Presentation, “Are American Elections Unfair? Exploring the Impact of Candidate Name Order.” Presentation at Vi at Palo Alto, Palo Alto, California.
- 2016 Invited Presentation, “The Future of Survey Research.” Lecture sponsored by the DC Chapter of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, Washington, DC.
- 2016 Invited Presentation, “The Future of Survey Research.” Lecture sponsored by the New York Chapter of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, Washington, DC.
- 2016 Invited Presentation, “The Future of Survey Research.” Lecture sponsored by the Survey Research Center, The Woodrow Wilson School, and the Center for the Study of Democratic Politics, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey.
- 2016 Invited Presentation, “The Future of Survey Research.” Lecture Sponsored by the Center for Survey Research, University of Massachusetts, Boston, Massachusetts.
- 2016 Invited Presentation, “Issue-Focused Passion in American Politics: What Happens When Citizens Become Deeply Committed to Pressuring Government on a Policy Issue.” Lecture Sponsored by the Departments of Psychology, Sociology, and Political Science, and the Center for Survey Research, University of Massachusetts, Boston, Massachusetts.
- 2016 Invited Commentary, “Science Gone Awry.” Tanner Lectures on Human Values, Sponsored by the University Center for Human Values: Trust and Distrust in Science, Princeton

University, Princeton, New Jersey.

- 2016 Invited Keynote Address, “Studying Political Attitudes as Survey Methodology Transforms.” Conference on “Inequality and Fairness of Political Reforms.” Hosted by the SFB 884 “Political Economy of Reforms” Project, University of Mannheim, Mannheim, Germany.
- 2017 Invited Presentation, “The Psychology of American Elections: Getting Into the Heads of Voters”. Presentation sponsored by the Stanford Alumni Association. Stanford in New York Facility, New York, New York.
- 2017 Invited Presentation, “The Challenges of Accurate Survey Measurement: The Case of Household Rostering.” Center for Survey Methodology, U.S. Census Bureau, Suitland, Maryland.
- 2017 Invited Address, “The Accuracy of Online Surveys with Non-probability Samples of People Who Volunteer to Do Surveys for Money.” Conference Entitled “Towards the Future: Forecasting in Social Studies” VII Sociology Grushin Conference, Sponsored by the Russia Public Opinion Research Center, Moscow, Russia.
- 2017 Invited Lecture, “Are Elections in America Unfair? Exploring the Impact of Candidate Name Order.” Lecture co-sponsored by the GESIS Leibniz Institute for Social Sciences and the Mannheim Center for European Social Research (MZES), University of Mannheim, Mannheim, Germany.
- 2017 Invited Presentation, “Attitude Measurement and Methodology”. Attitudes Conference, Annenberg Public Policy Center of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- 2017 Invited Presentation, “Campaign Ads that are Good for America.” Conference on Electoral Reform, Harris School for Public Policy, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.
- 2017 Invited Presentation, “Eliminating Unfairness: The Impact of Candidate Name Order.” Conference on Electoral Reform, Harris School for Public Policy, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.
- 2017 Invited Lecture, “How the Media Influence American Public Opinion.” Presentation at @America, sponsored by the U.S. Department of State, Jakarta, Indonesia.
- 2017 Invited presentation, “Challenges Impeding Comparability of Measurement Across Countries: Findings from an International Project Documenting Response Effects.” Conference on Advances in Scale Development in the Social Sciences: Issues of Comparability, University of Mannheim, sponsored by GESIS, Mannheim, Germany.
- 2017 Invited presentation, “Challenges Impeding Comparability of Measurement Across Countries: Findings from an International Project Documenting Response Effects.” Conference on Elections, parties, and Public Opinion in a Volatile World: A Comparative Perspective. University of Mannheim, sponsored by GESIS, the Mannheimer Zentrum fur Europäische Sozialforschung, and the University of Michigan’s Institute for Social Research, Mannheim, Germany.
- 2017 Invited panel member, “Keynote: The Politics of Climate Change.” Sixth Annual LCFS &

OPIS Carbon Markets Workshop, San Francisco, California.

- 2017 Invited lecture, “The Elections in America: Surprising Twists and Turns.” Stanford Center at Peking University Special Lecture, Beijing, China.
- 2017 Invited lecture, “Are Elections in America Unfair? Exploring the Impact of Candidate Name Order.” Methoden-Zentrum Sozialwissenschaften, Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, Göttingen, Germany.
- 2018 Inaugural Lecturer, Natalie Kahn Lecture Series, Department of Communication, University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California.
- 2018 Invited Lecture, “Social and Psychology Experiments Under the Microscope: Do Our Classic Experiments Replicate When Participant Are Representative of the General Public Rather Than Convenience Samples of College Students?” Centre for Experimental Social Sciences Seminar, Nuffield College, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom.
- 2018 Invited Lecture, “Passion in American Politics: What Happens When Citizens Become Deeply Committed to Pressuring Government on a Policy Issue”. Department of Psychology, University of Bath, Bath, United Kingdom.
- 2018 Invited Keynote Address, “An Update on the Accuracy of Probability Sample Surveys and Non-probability Sample Surveys.” Workshop on Probability-Based and Nonprobability Survey Research, Program on Political Economy of Reforms – SFB 884, University of Mannheim, Mannheim, Germany.
- 2018 Presentation, “Project Overview.” CPS Forum on Measuring Voter Turnout, Summer at Census, U.S. Census Bureau, Suitland, Maryland.
- 2018 Presentation, “Mode and Proxy Effects.” CPS Forum on Measuring Voter Turnout, Summer at Census, U.S. Census Bureau, Suitland, Maryland.
- 2018 Presentation, “Knowing More Than We Can Know.” CPS Forum on Measuring Voter Turnout, Summer at Census, U.S. Census Bureau, Suitland, Maryland.
- 2018 Invited Colloquium, “The Future of Survey Research: Meltdown or Opportunity?” Roper Center Speaker Series, Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.
- 2018 Invited Colloquium, “The Future of Survey Research: Meltdown or Opportunity?” GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences, Mannheim, Germany.

Editorial Board Member

- 1989-2000
2006-2008 Journal of Personality and Social Psychology
- 1990-1994 Journal of Experimental Social Psychology
- 1997-2003 Basic and Applied Social Psychology

1988-1991, 1994-2002	Public Opinion Quarterly
1998-2005	Media Psychology
2006-2008	Sociological Methodology
2008-	Pathways
2012-2017	Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology
2018-2020	Measurement Instruments for the Social Sciences

Internal Grants

1986	Ohio State University Office of Research and Graduate Studies Faculty Seed Grant, to support research on attitude importance.
1986	Ohio State University College of Social and Behavioral Sciences Research Expense Grant, to support research on social information processing and judgments about the self.
1987	Mershon Center Research Grant, to study the determinants of attitude importance.
1987	Ohio State University Office of Research and Graduate Studies Research Grant, to study the role of attitude importance in regulating political judgment.
1988	Ohio State University Office of Research and Graduate Studies, to support a study of the Arab/Israeli relations issue public in the United States (with Shibley Telhami).
1988	The Mershon Center, Ohio State University, to support a study of the Arab/Israeli relations issue public in the United States (with Shibley Telhami).
1988	Department of Political Science, Ohio State University, to support a study of the Arab/Israeli relations issue public in the United States (with Shibley Telhami).
1988	College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Ohio State University, to support a study of the Arab/Israeli relations issue public in the United States (with Shibley Telhami).
1991	Ohio State University Office of Research and Graduate Studies Research Grant, to study the role of satisficing in shaping responses to survey questionnaire measures of attitudes.
1993	Ohio State University Office of the Vice President for Research, to support preparation of a book on questionnaire design.
1995	College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Ohio State University, to support a study of the contingent valuation method of survey research.
1995	College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Ohio State University, to support a survey of public attitudes toward global warming.
1995	College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Ohio State University, to support research on questionnaire design.

1999	Mershon Center, Ohio State University. Foreign policy and election outcomes: A proposal to study the 2000 American Presidential election.
2003	VPUE Faculty Grant for Undergraduate Research, Stanford University.
2004	VPUE Faculty Grant for Undergraduate Research, Stanford University.
2005	VPUE Faculty Grant for Undergraduate Research, Stanford University.
2006	VPUE Faculty Grant for Undergraduate Research, Stanford University.
2007	VPUE Faculty Grant for Undergraduate Research, Stanford University.
2007	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Political Science Department, Stanford University.
2008	VPUE Faculty Grant for Undergraduate Research, Stanford University.
2008	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Political Science Department, Stanford University.
2009	VPUE Faculty Grant for Undergraduate Research, Stanford University.
2009	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Political Science Department, Stanford University.
2009	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Public Policy Program, Stanford University.
2010	VPUE Faculty Grant for Undergraduate Research, Stanford University.
2010	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Political Science Department, Stanford University.
2010	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Public Policy Program, Stanford University.
2011	VPUE Faculty Grant for Undergraduate Research, Stanford University.
2011	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Political Science Department, Stanford University.
2011	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Woods Institute for the Environment, Stanford University.
2011	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Public Policy Program, Stanford University.
2012	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Political Science Department, Stanford University.
2012	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Woods Institute for the Environment, Stanford University.

2012	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Public Policy Program, Stanford University.
2012	VPUE Faculty Grant for Undergraduate Research, Stanford University.
2013	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Political Science Department, Stanford University.
2013	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Woods Institute for the Environment, Stanford University.
2013	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Public Policy Program, Stanford University.
2014	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Political Science Department, Stanford University.
2014	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Woods Institute for the Environment, Stanford University.
2014	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Public Policy Program, Stanford University.
2014	Research Grant, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences.
2015	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Political Science Department, Stanford University.
2015	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Woods Institute for the Environment, Stanford University.
2015	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Public Policy Program, Stanford University.
2015	Research Grant, Spectrum-Stanford Health Care Innovation Challenge Program, Stanford University. (with Julie Parsonnet)
2016	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Political Science Department, Stanford University.
2017	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Public Policy Program, Stanford University.
2017	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Political Science Department, Stanford University.
2017	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Psychology Department, Stanford University.
2017	Summer Research Program on Energy Research, Precourt Institute for Energy, Stanford University.

2018	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Public Policy Program, Stanford University.
2018	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Political Science Department, Stanford University.
2018	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Psychology Department, Stanford University.
2018	Summer Research Program on Energy Research, Precourt Institute for Energy, Stanford University.

External Grants and Contracts

1977	CBS Research Grant, to support development and evaluation of a mass media promotional campaign for sound recordings.
1984	Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues Doctoral Dissertation Grant-in-aid.
1984	CBS Research Grant, to support literature review/research on the causes of heavy television viewing among children and adolescents.
1985	CBS Research Grant, to support empirical research on the effect of television viewing on alcohol use among children and adolescents.
1985	CBS Research Grant, to support empirical research on the causes of heavy television viewing among children and adolescents.
1987-1989	National Institute on Aging Research Grant, to study changes in political orientations over the life span (with Duane F. Alwin).
1987	National Association of Broadcasters Research Grant, to study the causes of heavy television viewing among children and adolescents.
1988	Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues Grant-in-Aid, to support research on the causes of heavy television viewing among children and adolescents.
1990-1992	National Science Foundation, The information processing consequences of attitude importance.
1991	National Science Foundation Research Experience for Undergraduates Grant Supplement, The information processing consequences of attitude importance.
1992	Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues Grant-in-Aid, to support research on the impact of the Gulf War on the constituents of presidential evaluations.
1992	National Science Foundation Research Experience for Undergraduates Grant Supplement, The information processing consequences of attitude importance.
1994	National Science Foundation, Explaining the surprising accuracy of mail surveys.
1995	National Science Foundation Research Experience for Undergraduates Grant Supplement, Explaining the surprising accuracy of mail surveys.

1995	U.S. Department of the Interior/Minerals Management Service/University of California Coastal Marine Institute, Testing and calibrating the measurement of nonmarket values for oil spills via the contingent valuation method (with Michael Hanemann).
1995	Electric Power Research Institute/Industrial Economics, Elicitation of public perceptions regarding the potential ecological effects of climate change (part I).
1996	Electric Power Research Institute/Industrial Economics, Elicitation of public perceptions regarding the potential ecological effects of climate change (part II).
1997	National Science Foundation, Formation and change of public beliefs about global warming.
1997	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration/U.S. Environmental Protection Agency/Resources for the Future, Formation and change of public beliefs about global warming: Wave II of survey interviewing.
1998, 1999, 2000, 2001	Robert Dodd and Associates/The Battelle Memorial Institute/National Aeronautics and Space Administration, National aviation operational monitoring system questionnaire development.
2000, 2001	Resources for the Future, American public opinion on the environment.
2001, 2002	Columbus Airport Authority, The dynamics and causes of airport customer satisfaction.
2002	Time-sharing Experiments for the Social Sciences (TESS) grant (funded by the National Science Foundation), Social desirability and reports of voter turnout (with Allyson L. Holbrook).
2003	National Science Foundation, Social and psychological mechanisms of the relation between age and openness to attitude change (with Penny Visser).
2003	New York Academy of Medicine/W. K. Kellogg Foundation, Engaging the community in terrorism preparedness planning.
2003	Decade of Behavior 2000-2010 Distinguished Lecture Program Grant to feature Richard E. Petty at the 2003 annual meeting of the American Association for Public Opinion Research.
2004	National Science Foundation, Optimizing the number of points on rating scales.
2004	The Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S Department of Labor, Refining the categorization of jobs in the biotechnology industry.
2005	National Science Foundation, 2005 Summer Institute in Political Psychology.
2005	National Science Foundation, Survey Research Methodology Optimization for the Science Resource Statistics Program.
2005	National Science Foundation, American National Election Studies 2005-2010 (with Arthur Lupia).
2006	American Psychological Association, The psychology of voting and election campaigns: A proposal for a stand-alone conference (with Wendy Wood, Arthur Lupia, and John Aldrich).

- 2006 National Science Foundation, Agenda-setting workshop in the area of e-science: Development of the next generation of cybertools applied to data collections in the social and behavioral sciences (with Arthur Lupia).
- 2006 National Science Foundation, Development of a computer network for experimental and non-experimental data collection via the Internet from a nationally representative sample of American households.
- 2006 National Science Foundation and the Department of Homeland Security, Expansion of the American National Election Study: Gauging the public's Attitudes on terrorism and homeland security (with Arthur Lupia).
- 2007 National Science Foundation, 2007 Summer Institute in Political Psychology.
- 2007 National Science Foundation, Survey Research Methodology Optimization for the Science Resource Statistics Program.
- 2007 National Science Foundation, Survey Research Methodology Optimization for the Science Resource Statistics Program (Supplement).
- 2007 National Science Foundation, Research Experience for Undergraduates Supplement for the American National Election Study. (with Arthur Lupia)
- 2007 National Science Foundation, The Impact of Polls on Political Behavior.
- 2007 National Science Foundation, American National Election Studies Supplement to Support Additional Pretesting of Questionnaire Items. (with Arthur Lupia)
- 2007 National Science Foundation, American National Election Studies Supplement to Support a Conference on Methodology for Coding Open-ended Question Responses. (with Arthur Lupia)
- 2008 National Science Foundation, SGER: DHS and NSF Collaboration: Developing Polls to Test Theories of Radicalization and Potential for Radicalization. (with Arthur Lupia)
- 2008 National Science Foundation, American National Election Studies Supplement to Create a Supplemental Panel to Study the 2008 American Presidential Election. (with Arthur Lupia)
- 2008 National Science Foundation, 2008 Summer Institute in Political Psychology.
- 2009 Time-sharing Experiments for the Social Sciences (TESS) grant (funded by the National Science Foundation), Does Mentioning 'Some People' and 'Other People' in an Attitude Question Improve Measurement Quality? (with David Yeager).
- 2009 National Science Foundation, 2009 Summer Institute in Political Psychology.
- 2009 Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, Surveying Public Opinion on Healthcare.
- 2009 Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Research and Polling Studies on Key Education Topics.
- 2009 National Science Foundation, 2010-2012 Summer Institute in Political Psychology.
- 2010 National Science Foundation, American National Election Studies Supplement to Develop and Test New Methods for Coding Open-ended Survey Data. (with Arthur Lupia)

- 2010 National Science Foundation, Discovering the Mechanisms of Belief and Attitude Change on Controversial Issues: The Case of Global Warming and Trust in Scientists.
- 2011 Marketing Science Institute, Establishing the Accuracy of Online Panels Research (with Lisa Brüggem, Rebecca Weiss, David Yeager, Rui Wang, and Yph Lelkes).
- 2012 National Science Foundation, Conferences on the Future of Survey Research.
- 2013 National Science Foundation, Supplement to Grant on the Future of Survey Research.
- 2014 National Science Foundation, American National Election Studies Supplement to Develop and Test New Methods for Coding Open-ended Survey Data. (with Arthur Lupia)
- 2014 Fetzer Franklin Fund, Exploring the Replicability of Psychological Findings.
- 2014 Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford University, CASBS Best Practices in Science Group: Empirical Studies, Article Writing, and Grant Proposal Preparation. (with Lee Jussim)
- 2015 The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, Maximizing Scientific Integrity. (with Lee Jussim)
- 2015 Marketing Science Institute, Beyond the Promotion of Net Promoter Score: A Research Deep Dive on “The One Number You Need to Grow.” (with Ellen Konar)
- 2015 Fetzer Franklin Fund, Maximizing Scientific Integrity: A Conference Proposal. (with Lee Jussim)
- 2017 National Science Foundation, Implicit Bias Conference
- 2017 National Science Foundation, Consumer Innovation Survey Development.

Research Partnerships with News Media Organizations

The New York Times
 ABC News
 The Associated Press
 Time Magazine
 The Washington Post
 USA Today
 New Scientist Magazine

Books

- Weisberg, H., Krosnick, J. A., & Bowen, B. (1989). Introduction to survey research and data analysis. Chicago: Scott, Foresman.
- Krosnick, J. A. (Ed.). (1990). Thinking about politics: Comparisons of experts and novices. New York: Guilford Press (Book version of a special issue of Social Cognition, Volume 8, Number 1, 1990).

- Petty, R. E., & Krosnick, J. A. (Eds.). (1995). Attitude strength: Antecedents and consequences. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Weisberg, H., Krosnick, J. A., & Bowen, B. (1996). Introduction to survey research, polling, and data analysis. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Carson, R. T., Conaway, M. B., Hanemann, W. M., Krosnick, J. A., Mitchell, R. C., Presser, S. (2004). Valuing oil spill prevention: A case study of California's central coast. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Callegaro, M., Baker, R., Bethlehem, J., Göritz, A., Krosnick, J. A., & Lavrakas, P. J. (Eds.). (2014). Online panel research: A data quality perspective. West Sussex, UK: John Wiley and Sons.
- Review: Cornesse, C., & Blom, A. G. (2015). Review of Online Panel Research: A Data Quality Perspective. Journal of Official Statistics, 31, 809-812.
- Krosnick, J. A., Chiang, I.-C., & Stark, T. (Eds.) (2017). Political psychology: New explorations. Psychology Press. New York, New York.
- Vannette, D. L., & Krosnick, J. A. (Eds.) (2018). The Palgrave handbook of survey research. London, UK: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Fabrigar, L. R. (forthcoming). The handbook of questionnaire design. New York: Oxford University Press.

Journal Articles and Book Chapters

- Krosnick, J. A. (1978). One approach to the analysis of drumset playing. Percussive Notes, Spring-Summer, 143-149.
- Judd, C. M., Krosnick, J. A., & Milburn, M. A. (1981). Political involvement and attitude structure in the general public. American Sociological Review, 46, 660-669.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Judd, C. M. (1982). Transitions in social influence at adolescence: Who induces cigarette smoking? Developmental Psychology, 18, 359-368.
- Judd, C. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (1982). Attitude centrality, organization, and measurement. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42, 436-447.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1982). Teaching percussion: Growing with your students. National Association of College Wind and Percussion Instructors Journal, Summer, 4-7.
- Judd, C. M., Kenny, D. A., & Krosnick, J. A. (1983). Judging the positions of political candidates: Models of assimilation and contrast. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44, 952-963.
- McAlister, A. L., Krosnick, J. A., & Milburn, M. A. (1984). Causes of adolescent cigarette smoking: Tests of a structural equation model. Social Psychology Quarterly, 47, 24-36.
- Iyengar, S., Kinder, D. R., Peters, M. D., & Krosnick, J. A. (1984). The evening news and presidential evaluations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46, 778-787.
- Reprinted in Peplau, L. A., Sears, D. O., Taylor, S. E., & Freedman, J. L. (Eds.) (1988), Readings in social psychology: Classic and contemporary contributions. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Alwin, D. F., & Krosnick, J. A. (1985). The measurement of values in surveys: A comparison of ratings and rankings. Public Opinion Quarterly, 49, 535-552.
- Reprinted in Singer, E., & Presser, S. (Eds.) (1989). Survey research methods: A reader. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Reprinted in Bartholomew, D. (Ed.) (2006). Measurement. Oxford, UK: The Bardwell Press.
- Schuman, H., Ludwig, J., & Krosnick, J. A. (1986). The perceived threat of nuclear war, salience, and open questions. Public Opinion Quarterly, 50, 519-536.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Alwin, D. F. (1987). An evaluation of a cognitive theory of response order effects in survey measurement. Public Opinion Quarterly, 51, 201-219.
- Reprinted in Roberts, C., & Jowell, R. (Eds.) (2008). Attitude measurement. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1988). Attitude importance and attitude change. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 24, 240-255.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Schuman, H. (1988). Attitude intensity, importance, and certainty and susceptibility to response effects. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54, 940-952.
- Reprinted in Roberts, C., & Jowell, R. (Eds.) (2008). Attitude measurement. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1988). The role of attitude importance in social evaluation: A study of policy preferences, presidential candidate evaluations, and voting behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55, 196-210.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Alwin, D. F. (1988). A test of the form-resistant correlation hypothesis: Ratings, rankings, and the measurement of values. Public Opinion Quarterly, 52, 526-538.
- Judd, C. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (1989). The structural bases of consistency among political attitudes: The effects of political expertise and attitude importance. In A. R. Pratkanis, S. J. Breckler, & A. G. Greenwald (Eds.), Attitude Structure and Function. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1989). Attitude importance and attitude accessibility. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 15, 297-308.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1989). Question wording and reports of survey results: The case of Louis Harris and Aetna Life and Casualty. Public Opinion Quarterly, 53, 107-113.
- Reprinted in Bulmer, M. (Ed.) (2004), Questionnaires. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Alwin, D. F. (1989). Aging and susceptibility to attitude change. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57, 416-425.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1990). Government policy and citizen passion: A study of issue publics in contemporary America. Political Behavior, 12, 59-92.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1990). Expertise in political psychology. Social Cognition, 8, 1-8. (also in J. Krosnick (Ed.), Thinking about politics: Comparisons of experts and novices. New York: Guilford, 1990, pp. 1-8).

- Krosnick, J. A. (1990). Lessons learned: A review and integration of our findings. Social Cognition, 8, 154-158. (also in J. Krosnick (Ed.), Thinking about politics: Comparisons of experts and novices. New York: Guilford, 1990, pp. 154-158).
- Krosnick, J. A., Li, F., & Lehman, D. (1990). Conversational conventions, order of information acquisition, and the effect of base rates and individuating information on social judgments. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59, 1140-1152.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Milburn, M. A. (1990). Psychological determinants of political opinionation. Social Cognition, 8, 49-72. (also in J. Krosnick (Ed.), Thinking about politics: Comparisons of experts and novices. New York: Guilford, 1990, pp. 49-72).
- Krosnick, J. A., & Sedikides, C. (1990). Self-monitoring and self-protective biases in the use of consensus information to predict one's own behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58, 718-728.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Kinder, D. R. (1990). Altering the foundations of support for the president through priming. American Political Science Review, 84, 497-512.
- Reprinted in J. T. Jost and J. Sidanius (Eds.) (2004). Political psychology: Key readings. New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Reprinted in K. Arzheimer & J. Evans (Eds.) (2008). Electoral behaviour. London: Sage Publications.
- Reprinted in T. Høgenhagen and S. Winther Nielsen (Eds.) (2009). Politisk psykologi-antologi. Århus, Denmark: Aarhus University Press.
- Alwin, D. F., & Krosnick, J. A. (1991). Aging, cohorts, and the stability of sociopolitical orientations over the life span. American Journal of Sociology, 97, 169-195.
- Alwin, D. F., & Krosnick, J. A. (1991). The reliability of survey attitude measurement: The influence of question and respondent attributes. Sociological Methods and Research, 20, 139-181.
- Judd, C. M., Drake, R. A., Downing, J. W., & Krosnick, J. A. (1991). Some dynamic properties of attitude structures: Context induced response facilitation and polarization. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60, 193-202.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1990). Americans' perceptions of presidential candidates: A test of the projection hypothesis. Journal of Social Issues, 46, 159-182.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1991). Response strategies for coping with the cognitive demands of attitude measures in surveys. Applied Cognitive Psychology, 5, 213-236.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1991). The stability of political preferences: Comparisons of symbolic and non-symbolic attitudes. American Journal of Political Science, 35, 547-576.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1992). The impact of cognitive sophistication and attitude importance on response order effects and question order effects. In N. Schwarz and S. Sudman (Eds.), Order effects in social and psychological research (pp. 203-218). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Abelson, R. P. (1992). The case for measuring attitude strength in surveys. Pp. 177-203 in J. Tanur (Ed.), Questions about questions: Inquiries into the cognitive bases of surveys. New York: Russell Sage.

- Krosnick, J. A., Betz, A. L., Jussim, L. J., & Lynn, A. R. (1992). Subliminal conditioning of attitudes. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18, 152-162.
- Lehman, D. R., Krosnick, J. A., West, R. L., & Li, F. (1992). The focus of judgment effect: A question wording effect due to hypothesis confirmation bias. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18, 690-699.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Berent, M. K. (1993). Comparisons of party identification and policy preferences: The impact of survey question format. American Journal of Political Science, 37, 941-964.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Brannon, L. A. (1993). The impact of the Gulf War on the ingredients of presidential evaluations: Multidimensional effects of political involvement. American Political Science Review, 87, 963-975.
- Reprinted in H. T. Reis (Ed.). (2014). Methodological Innovations in Social Psychology. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Brannon, L. A. (1993). The media and the foundations of Presidential support: George Bush and the Persian Gulf conflict. Journal of Social Issues, 49, 167-182.
- Krosnick, J. A., Boninger, D. S., Chuang, Y. C., Berent, M. K., & Carnot, C. G. (1993). Attitude strength: One construct or many related constructs? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65, 1132-1149.
- Reprinted in S. T. Fiske (Ed.) (2013). Social Cognition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Krosnick, J. A., Berent, M. K., & Boninger, D. S. (1994). Pockets of responsibility in the American electorate: Findings of a research program on attitude importance. Political Communication, 11, 391-411.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Smith, W. A. (1994). Attitude strength. In V. S. Ramachandran (Ed.), Encyclopedia of human behavior. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Ostrom, T. M., Bond, C., Krosnick, J. A., & Sedikides, C. (1994). Attitude scales: How we measure the unmeasurable. In S. Shavitt & T. C. Brock (Eds.), Persuasion: Psychological insights and perspectives. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Rahn, W. M., Krosnick, J. A., & Breuning, M. (1994). Rationalization and derivation processes in survey studies of political candidate evaluation. American Journal of Political Science, 38, 582-600.
- Berent, M. K., & Krosnick, J. A. (1995). The relation between political attitude importance and knowledge structure. In M. Lodge & K. McGraw (Eds.), Political judgment: Structure and process. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Boninger, D. S., Krosnick, J. A., & Berent, M. K. (1995). The origins of attitude importance: Self-interest, social identification, and value-relevance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68, 61-80.
- Boninger, D. S., Krosnick, J. A., Berent, M. K., & Fabrigar, L. R. (1995). The causes and consequences of attitude importance. In R. E. Petty and J. A. Krosnick (Eds.), Attitude strength: Antecedents and consequences. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Fabrigar, L. R., & Krosnick, J. A. (1995). Attitude importance and the false consensus effect. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21, 468-479.

- Fabrigar, L. R., & Krosnick, J. A. (1995). Attitude measurement and questionnaire design. In A. S. R. Manstead & M. Hewstone (Eds.), Blackwell encyclopedia of social psychology. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Fabrigar, L. R., & Krosnick, J. A. (1995). Voting behavior. In A. S. R. Manstead & M. Hewstone (Eds.), Blackwell encyclopedia of social psychology. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Petty, R. E. (1995). Attitude strength: An overview. In R. E. Petty and J. A. Krosnick (Eds.), Attitude strength: Antecedents and consequences. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Telhami, S. (1995). Public attitudes toward Israel: A study of the attentive and issue publics. International Studies Quarterly, 39, 535-554.
- Reprinted in Israel Affairs, vol. 2 (1995/1996).
- Reprinted in G. Sheffer (Ed.) (1997). U.S.-Israeli relations at the crossroads (Israeli history, politics, and society). London: Frank Cass & Co., Ltd.
- Wegener, D. T., Downing, J., Krosnick, J. A., & Petty, R. E. (1995). Measures and manipulations of strength-related properties of attitudes: Current practice and future directions. In R. E. Petty and J. A. Krosnick (Eds.), Attitude strength: Antecedents and consequences. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Weisberg, H. F., Haynes, A. A., & Krosnick, J. A. (1995). Social group polarization in 1992. In H. F. Weisberg (Ed.), Democracy's feast: Elections in America. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House.
- Krosnick, J. A., Narayan, S. S., & Smith, W. R. (1996). Satisficing in surveys: Initial evidence. In M. T. Braverman & J. K. Slater (Eds.), Advances in survey research (pp. 29-44). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Miller, J. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (1996). News media impact on the ingredients of presidential evaluations: A program of research on the priming hypothesis. In D. Mutz & P. Sniderman (Eds.), Political persuasion and attitude change. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Narayan, S., & Krosnick, J. A. (1996). Education moderates some response effects in attitude measurement. Public Opinion Quarterly, 60, 58-88.
- Reprinted in S. Gorard (Ed.) (2008). Quantitative research in education. London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Visser, P. S., Krosnick, J. A., Marquette, J., & Curtin, M. (1996). Mail surveys for election forecasting? An evaluation of the Columbus Dispatch poll. Public Opinion Quarterly, 60, 181-227.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Fabrigar, L. R. (1997). Designing rating scales for effective measurement in surveys. In L. Lyberg, P. Biemer, M. Collins, L. Decker, E. DeLeeuw, C. Dippo, N. Schwarz, and D. Trewin (Eds.), Survey Measurement and Process Quality. New York: Wiley-Interscience.
- Miller, J. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (1997). The anatomy of news media priming. In S. Iyengar and R. Reeves (Eds.), Do the media govern? Politicians, voters, and reporters in America. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Carson, R. T., Hanemann, W. M., Kopp, R. J., Krosnick, J. A., Mitchell, R. C., Presser, S., Ruud, P. A., & Smith, V. K., with Conaway, M., & Martin, K. (1997). Temporal reliability of estimates from contingent valuation. Land Economics, 73, 151-163.

- Carson, R. T., Hanemann, W. M., Kopp, R. J., Krosnick, J. A., Mitchell, R. C., Presser, S., Ruud, P. A., & Smith, V. K., with Conaway, M., & Martin, K. (1998). Referendum design and contingent valuation: The NOAA panel's no-vote recommendation. Review of Economics and Statistics, 80, 335-338.
- Miller, J. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (1998). The impact of candidate name order on election outcomes. Public Opinion Quarterly, 62, 291-330.
- Visser, P. S., & Krosnick, J. A. (1998). The development of attitude strength over the life cycle: Surge and decline. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75, 1388-1409.
- Reprinted in G. Haddock and G. R. Maio (Eds.) (2012), *The psychology of attitudes: Key readings*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1999). Maximizing questionnaire quality. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), Measures of political attitudes. New York: Academic Press.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1999). Survey research. Annual Review of Psychology, 50, 537-567.
- Bassili, J. N., & Krosnick, J. A. (2000). Do strength-related attitude properties determine susceptibility to response effects? New evidence from response latency, attitude extremity, and aggregate indices. Political Psychology, 21, 107-132.
- Holbrook, A. L., Krosnick, J. A., Carson, R. T., & Mitchell, R. C. (2000). Violating conversational conventions disrupts cognitive processing of attitude questions. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 36, 465-494.
- Holbrook, A. L., Bizer, G. Y., & Krosnick, J. A. (2000). Political behavior of the individual. In A. E. Kazdin (Ed.), Encyclopedia of psychology. Washington, DC, and New York, NY: American Psychological Association and Oxford University Press.
- Krosnick, J. A., Holbrook, A. L., & Visser, P. S. (2000). The impact of the Fall 1997 debate about global warming on American public opinion. Public Understanding of Science, 9, 239-260.
- Miller, J. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (2000). News media impact on the ingredients of presidential evaluations: Politically knowledgeable citizens are guided by a trusted source. American Journal of Political Science, 44, 301-315.
- Visser, P. S., Krosnick, J. A., & Lavrakas, P. (2000). Survey research. In H. T. Reis & C. M. Judd (Eds.), Handbook of research methods in social psychology. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Visser, P. S., Krosnick, J. A., Marquette, J., & Curtin, M. (2000). Improving election forecasting: Allocation of undecided respondents, identification of likely voters, and response order effects. In P. Lavrakas & M. Traugott (Eds.), Election polls, the news media, and democracy. New York, NY: Chatham House.
- Bizer, G. Y., & Krosnick, J. A. (2001). Exploring the structure of strength-related attitude features: The relation between attitude importance and attitude accessibility. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81, 566-586.
- Holbrook, A. L., Krosnick, J. A., Visser, P. S., Gardner, W. L., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2001). Attitudes toward presidential candidates and political parties: Initial optimism, inertial first impressions, and a focus on flaws. American Journal of Political Science, 45, 930-950.
- Reprinted in Lavine, H. (Ed.) (2010). Political psychology. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Krosnick, J. A. (2002). Is political psychology sufficiently psychological? Distinguishing political psychology from psychological political science. In J. Kuklinski (Ed.), Thinking about political psychology. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2002). The challenges of political psychology: Lessons to be learned from research on attitude perception. In J. Kuklinski (Ed.), Thinking about political psychology. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2002). The causes of no-opinion responses to attitude measures in surveys: They are rarely what they appear to be. In R. M. Groves, D. A. Dillman, J. L. Eltinge, & R. J. A. Little (Eds.), Survey nonresponse. New York: Wiley.
- Krosnick, J. A., Holbrook, A. L., Berent, M. K., Carson, R. T., Hanemann, W. M., Kopp, R. J., Mitchell, R. C., Presser, S., Ruud, P. A., Smith, V. K., Moody, W. R., Green, M. C., & Conaway, M. (2002). The impact of "no opinion" response options on data quality: Non-attitude reduction or an invitation to satisfice? Public Opinion Quarterly, *66*, 371-403.
- Reprinted in Roberts, C., & Jowell, R. (Eds.) (2008). Attitude measurement. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Krosnick, J. A., & McGraw K. M. (2002). Psychological political science vs. political psychology true to its name: A plea for balance. In K. R. Monroe (Ed.), Political psychology. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Swait, J., Adamowicz, W., Hanemann, M., Diederich, A., Krosnick, J. A., Layton, D., Provencher, W., Schakade, D., & Tourangeau, R. (2002). Context dependence and aggregation in disaggregate choice analysis. Marketing Letters, *13*, 195-205.
- Anand, S., & Krosnick, J. A. (2003). The impact of attitudes toward foreign policy goals on public preferences among presidential candidates: A study of issue publics and the attentive public in the 2000 U.S. Presidential election. Presidential Studies Quarterly, *33*, 31-71.
- Chang, L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2003). Measuring the frequency of regular behaviors: Comparing the 'typical week' to the 'past week.' Sociological Methodology, *33*, 55-80.
- Holbrook, A. L., Green, M. C., & Krosnick, J. A. (2003). Telephone vs. face-to-face interviewing of national probability samples with long questionnaires: Comparisons of respondent satisficing and social desirability response bias. Public Opinion Quarterly, *67*, 79-125.
- Krosnick, J. A., Anand, S. N., & Hartl, S. P. (2003). Psychosocial predictors of heavy television viewing among preadolescents and adolescents. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, *25*, 87-110.
- Visser, P. S., Krosnick, J. A., & Simmons, J. (2003). Distinguishing the cognitive and behavioral consequences of attitude importance and certainty: A new approach to testing the common-factor hypothesis. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, *39*, 118-141.
- Bizer, G. Y., Krosnick, J. A., Holbrook, A. L., Wheeler, S. C., Rucker, D. D., & Petty, R. E. (2004). The impact of personality on cognitive, behavioral, and affective political processes: The effects of need to evaluate. Journal of Personality, *72*, 995-1028.
- Bizer, G. Y., Visser, P. S., Berent, M. K., & Krosnick, J. A. (2004). Importance, knowledge, and accessibility: Exploring the dimensionality of strength-related attitude properties. In W. E. Saris & P. M. Sniderman (Eds.), Studies in public opinion: Gauging attitudes, nonattitudes, measurement error and change. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Krosnick, J. A., Miller, J. M., & Tichy, M. P. (2004). An unrecognized need for ballot reform: Effects of candidate name order. In A. N. Crigler, M. R. Just, and E. J. McCaffery (Eds.), Rethinking the vote: The politics and prospects of American election reform. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Miller, J. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (2004). Threat as a motivator of political activism: A field experiment. Political Psychology, 25, 507-523.
- Anand, S., & Krosnick, J. A. (2005). Demographic predictors of media use among infants, toddlers, and preschoolers. American Behavioral Scientist, 48, 539-561.
- Holbrook, A. L., Berent, M. K., Krosnick, J. A., Visser, P. S., & Boninger, D. S. (2005). Attitude importance and the accumulation of attitude-relevant knowledge in memory. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88, 749-769.
- Holbrook, A. L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2005). Meta-psychological vs. operative measures of ambivalence: Differentiating the consequences of perceived intra-psychic conflict and real intra-psychic conflict. In S. C. Craig & M. D. Martinez (Eds.), Ambivalence and the structure of public opinion. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Krosnick, J. A., Judd, C. M., & Wittenbrink, B. (2005). The measurement of attitudes. In D. Albarracín, B. T. Johnson, & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), Handbook of attitudes and attitude change. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Reprinted in Roberts, C., & Jowell, R. (Eds.) (2008). Attitude measurement. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Schaeffer, E. M., Krosnick, J. A., Langer, G. E., & Merkle, D. M. (2005). Comparing the quality of data obtained by minimally balanced and fully balanced attitude questions. Public Opinion Quarterly, 69, 417-428.
- Fabrigar, L. R., Krosnick, J. A., & MacDougall, B. L. (2006). Attitude measurement: Techniques for measuring the unobservable. In M. C. Green, S. Shavitt, & T. C. Brock (Eds.), Persuasion: Psychological insights and perspectives. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Krosnick, J. A., Chang, L., Sherman, S. J., Chassin, L., & Presson, C. (2006). The effects of beliefs about the health consequences of cigarette smoking on smoking onset. Journal of Communication, 56, S18-S37.
- Krosnick, J. A., Holbrook, A. L., Lowe, L. & Visser, P. S. (2006). The origins and consequences of democratic citizens' policy agendas: A study of popular concern about global warming. Climatic Change, 77, 7-43.
- Krosnick, J. A., Holbrook, A. L., & Visser, P. S. (2006). Optimizing brief assessments in research on the psychology of aging: A pragmatic approach to survey and self-report measurement. In National Research Council, *When I'm 64*. Committee on Aging Frontiers in Social Psychology, Personality, and Adult Developmental Psychology. Laura L. Carstensen and Christine R. Hartel, editors. Board on Behavioral, Cognitive, and Sensory Sciences, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Visser, P. S., Bizer, G. Y., & Krosnick, J. A. (2006). Exploring the latent structure of strength-related attitude attributes. In M. Zanna (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Cornell, D. G., Krosnick, J. A., & Chang, L. (2006). Student reactions to being wrongly informed of failing a high-stakes test: The case of the Minnesota Basic Standards Test. Educational Policy, 20, 718-751.

- Holbrook, A. L., Krosnick, J. A., Moore, D., & Tourangeau, R. (2007). Response order effects in dichotomous categorical questions presented orally: The impact of question and respondent attributes. Public Opinion Quarterly, 71, 325-348.
- Malhotra, N., & Krosnick, J. A. (2007). The effect of survey mode on inferences about political attitudes and behavior: Comparing the 2000 and 2004 ANES to internet surveys with non-probability samples. Political Analysis, 15, 286-323.
- Malhotra, N., & Krosnick, J. A. (2007). Retrospective and prospective performance assessments during the 2004 election campaign: Tests of mediation and news media priming. Political Behavior, 29, 249-278.
- Malhotra, N. & Krosnick, J. A. (2007). Procedures for updating classification systems: A study of biotechnology and the standard occupational classification system. Journal of Official Statistics, 23, 409-432.
- Schneider, D., Tahk, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2007). Reconsidering the impact of behavior prediction questions on illegal drug use: The importance of using proper analytic methods in social psychology. Social Influence, 2, 178-196.
- Holbrook, A. L., Krosnick, J. A., & Pfent, A. M. (2008). The causes and consequences of response rates in surveys by the news media and government contractor survey research firms. In J. M. Lepkowski, C. Tucker, J. M. Brick, E. D. De Leeuw, L. Japac, P. J. Lavrakas, M. W. Link, & R. L. Sangster (Eds.), Advances in telephone survey methodology. New York: Wiley.
- Iyengar, S., Hahn, K. S., Krosnick, J. A., & Walker, J. (2008). Selective exposure to campaign communication: The role of anticipated agreement and issue public membership. Journal of Politics, 70, 186-200.
- Visser, P. S., Holbrook, A. L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2008). Knowledge and attitudes. In W. Donsbach & M. W. Traugott (Eds.), Handbook of public opinion research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- Harder, J., & Krosnick, J. A. (2008). Why do people vote? A psychological analysis of the causes of voter turnout. Journal of Social Issues, 64, 525-549.
- Krosnick, J. A., Malka, A., & Yeager, D. S. (2009). State of the nation: Getting warmer. Boston Review, 34, 6.
- Krosnick, J. A., Visser, P. S., & Harder, J. (2009). The psychological underpinnings of political behavior. In S. T. Fiske, D. T. Gilbert, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), Handbook of social psychology. New York, NY: John Wiley.
- Malka, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2009). The association of knowledge with concern about global warming: Trusted information sources shape public thinking. Risk Analysis, 29, 633-647.
- Rabinowitz, J. L., Sears, D. O., Sidanius, J., & Krosnick, J. A. (2009). Why do white Americans oppose race-targeted policies? Clarifying the impact of symbolic racism. Political Psychology, 30, 805-828.
- Chang, L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2009). National surveys via RDD telephone interviewing vs. the Internet: Comparing sample representativeness and response quality. Public Opinion Quarterly, 73, 641-678.
- Eaton, A. A., Visser, P. S., Krosnick, J. A., & Anand, S. (2009). Social power and attitude strength over the life cycle. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35, 1646-1660.

- Malhotra, N., Krosnick, J. A., and Thomas, R. K. (2009). Optimal design of branching questions to measure bipolar constructs. Public Opinion Quarterly, 73, 304-324.
- Pasek, J., Tahk, A., Lelkes, Y., Krosnick, J. A., Payne, K., Akhtar, O., & Tompson, T. (2009). Determinants of turnout and candidate choice in the 2008 U.S. Presidential election: Illuminating the impact of racial prejudice and other considerations. Public Opinion Quarterly, 73, 943-994.
- Baker, R., Blumberg, S., Brick, J. M., Couper, M. P., Courtright, M., Dennis, M., Dillman, D., Frankel, M. R., Garland, P., Groves, R. M., Kennedy, C., Krosnick, J. A., Lee, D., Lavrakas, P. J., Link, M., Piekarski, L., Rao, K., Thomas, R. K., & Zahs, D. (2010). AAPOR report on online panels. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1-71.
- Chang, L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2010). Comparing oral interviewing with self-administered computerized questionnaires: An experiment. Public Opinion Quarterly, 74, 154-167.
- Holbrook, A. L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2010). Social desirability bias in voter turnout reports: Tests using the item count technique. Public Opinion Quarterly, 74, 37-67.
- Holbrook, A. L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2010). Measuring voter turnout by using the randomized response technique: Evidence calling into question the method's validity. Public Opinion Quarterly, 74, 328-343.
- Holbrook, A. L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2010). Operative and meta-psychological manifestations of attitude accessibility: Two different constructs, not two measures of the same construct. In J. P. Forgas, J. Cooper, & W. D. Crano (Eds.), The Psychology of Attitudes and Attitude Change. Florence, Kentucky: Psychology Press.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Presser, S. (2010). Questionnaire design. In J. D. Wright & P. V. Marsden (Eds.), Handbook of survey research (Second Edition). West Yorkshire, England: Emerald Group.
- Pasek, J., & Krosnick, J. A. (2010). Optimizing survey questionnaire design in political science: Insights from psychology. In J. Leighley (Ed.), Oxford handbook of American elections and political behavior. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Payne, B. K., Krosnick, J. A., Pasek, J., Lelkes, Y., Akhtar, O., & Tompson, T. (2010). Implicit and explicit prejudice in the 2008 American presidential election. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 46, 367-374.
- Saris, W., Revilla, M., Krosnick, J. A., & Shaeffer, E. (2010). Comparing questions with agree/disagree response options to questions with item-specific response options. Survey Research Methods, 4, 61-79.
- Schneider, D., DeBell, M., & Krosnick, J. A. (2010). Using the American National Election Study surveys to test social psychological hypotheses. In K. Trzesniewski, M. B. Donnellan, & R. E. Lucas (Eds.), Secondary Data Analysis: An Introduction for Psychologists. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Yeager, D. S., & Krosnick, J. A. (2010). The validity of self-reported nicotine product use in the 2001-2008 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey. Medical Care, 48, 1128-1132.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2011). Experiments for evaluating survey questions. In K. Miller, J. Madans, G. Willis, & A. Maitland (Eds.), Question evaluation methods. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Lupia, A. (2011). The American National Election Studies and the importance of new ideas. In J. A. Aldrich & K. M. McGraw (Eds.), Improving public opinion surveys: Interdisciplinary innovation and the American National Election Studies. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Krosnick, J. A., & Lupia, A. (2011). How the ANES used online commons proposals and pilot study reports to develop its 2008 questionnaires. In J. A. Aldrich & K. M. McGraw (Eds.), Improving public opinion surveys: Interdisciplinary innovation and the American National Election Studies. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Villar, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2011). Global warming vs. climate change, taxes vs. prices: Does word choice matter? Climatic Change, 105, 1-12.
- Yeager, D. S., & Krosnick, J. A. (2011). Re: Response to the validity of self-reported nicotine product use in the 2001-2008 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey. Medical Care, 49, 332.
- Yeager, D. S., & Krosnick, J. A. (2011). Does mentioning “some people” and “other people” in a survey question increase the accuracy of adolescents’ self-reports? Developmental Psychology, 47, 1674-1679.
- Yeager, D. S., Larson, S. B., Krosnick, J. A., & Tompson, T. (2011). Measuring Americans’ issue priorities: A new version of the most important problem question reveals more concern about global warming and the environment. Public Opinion Quarterly, 75, 125-138.
- Yeager, D. S., Krosnick, J. A., Chang, L., Javitz, H. S., Levendusky, M. S., Simpser, A., & Wang, R. (2011). Comparing the accuracy of RDD telephone surveys and Internet surveys conducted with probability and non-probability samples. Public Opinion Quarterly, 75, 709-747.
- Cor, K., Haertel, E., Krosnick, J. A., & Malhotra, N. (2012). Improving ability measurement in surveys by following the principles of IRT: The Wordsum vocabulary test in the General Social Survey. Social Science Research, 41, 1003-1016.
- Daniels, D. P., Krosnick, J. A., Tichy, M. P., & Tompson, T. (2012). Public opinion on environmental policy in the United States. In M. Kraft & S. Kamieniecki (Eds.), Handbook of U.S. Environmental Policy. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lelkes, Y., Krosnick, J. A., Marks, D. M., Judd, C. M., & Park, B. (2012). Complete anonymity compromises the accuracy of self-reports. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48, 1291-1299.
- Yeager, D. S., & Krosnick, J. A. (2012). Does mentioning “some people” and “other people” in an opinion question improve measurement quality? Public Opinion Quarterly, 76, 131-141.
- Holbrook, A. L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2013). A new question sequence to measure voter turnout in telephone surveys: Results of an experiment in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study. Public Opinion Quarterly, 77, 106-123.
- Krosnick, J. A., & MacInnis, B. (2013). Does the American public support legislation to reduce greenhouse gas emissions? Deadalus, 142, 26-39.
- Revilla, M. A., Saris, W. E., & Krosnick, J. A. (2014). Choosing the number of categories in agree-disagree scales. Sociological Methods and Research, 43, 73-97.
- Callegaro, M., Baker, R., Bethlehem, J., Göritz, A., Krosnick, J. A., & Lavrakas, P. J. (2014). Online panel research: History, concepts, applications, and a look at the future. In Callegaro, M., Baker, R., Bethlehem, J., Göritz, A., Krosnick, J. A., & Lavrakas, P. J. (Eds.). (2014). Online panel research: A data quality perspective. West Sussex, UK: John Wiley and Sons.
- Callegaro M., Villar, A., Krosnick, J. A., & Yeager, D. (2014). A critical review of studies investigating the quality of data obtained with online panels. In Callegaro, M., Baker, R., Bethlehem, J., Göritz, A.,

- Krosnick, J. A., & Lavrakas, P. J. (Eds.). (2014). Online panel research: A data quality perspective. West Sussex, UK: John Wiley and Sons.
- Callegaro, M., & Krosnick, J. A. (2014). Introduction to Part I. In Callegaro, M., Baker, R., Bethlehem, J., Göritz, A., Krosnick, J. A., & Lavrakas, P. J. (Eds.). (2014). Online panel research: A data quality perspective. West Sussex, UK: John Wiley and Sons.
- Chen, E., Simonovits, G., Krosnick, J. A., & Pasek, J. (2014). The impact of candidate name order on election outcomes in North Dakota. Electoral Studies, *35*, 115-122.
- Göritz, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2014). Introduction to Part IV. In Callegaro, M., Baker, R., Bethlehem, J., Göritz, A., Krosnick, J. A., & Lavrakas, P. J. (Eds.). (2014). Online panel research: A data quality perspective. West Sussex, UK: John Wiley and Sons.
- Krosnick, J. A., Malhotra, N., & Mittal, U. (2014). Public misunderstanding of political facts: How question wording affected estimates of partisan differences in birtherism. Public Opinion Quarterly, *78*, 147-165.
- Krosnick, J. A., Lavrakas, P., & Kim, N. (2014). Survey research. In H. T. Reis & C. M. Judd (Eds.), Handbook of research methods in social psychology (Second Edition). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Pasek, J., Schneider, D., Krosnick, J. A., Tahk, A., & Ophir, E. (2014). Prevalence and moderators of the candidate name-order effect: Evidence from all statewide general elections in California. Public Opinion Quarterly, *78*, 416-439.
- Pasek, J., Stark, T. H., Krosnick, J. A., Thompson, T., & Payne, B. K. (2014). Attitudes toward Blacks in the Obama era: Changing distributions and impacts on job approval and electoral choice, 2008-2012. Public Opinion Quarterly, *78*, 276-302.
- Vannette, D. L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2014). A comparison of mindless and survey satisficing. In A. Ie, C. T. Ngunoumen, & E. J. Langer (Eds.), The Wiley-Blackwell Handbook of Mindfulness. West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kim, N., Krosnick, J. A., & Casasanto, D. (2015). Moderators of candidate name order effects in elections: An experiment. Political Psychology, *36*, 525-542.
- Krosnick, J. A., & MacInnis, B. (2015). Fox and Not-Fox television news impact on opinions on global warming: Selective exposure, not motivated reasoning. In J. P. Forgas, K. Fiedler, & W. D. Crano (Eds.), Social Psychology and Politics. New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- MacInnis, B., Krosnick, J. A., Abeles, A., Caldwell, M. R., Prahl, E., & Dunne, D. D. (2015). The American public's preference for preparation for the possible effects of global warming: Impact of communication strategies. Climatic Change, *128*, 17-33.
- Pasek, J., Sood, G., & Krosnick, J. A. (2015). Misinformed about the Affordable Care Act? Leveraging certainty to assess the prevalence of misperceptions. Journal of Communication, *65*, 660-673.
- Pasek, J., Stark, T. H., Krosnick, J. A., & Thompson, T. (2015). What motivates a conspiracy theory? Birther beliefs, partisanship, liberal-conservative ideology, and anti-Black attitudes. Electoral Studies, *40*, 482-489.
- Berent, M. K., Krosnick, J. A., & Lupia, A. (2016). Measuring voter registration and turnout in surveys: Do official government records yield more accurate assessments? Public Opinion Quarterly, *80*, 597-621.

- Chapman, D. J., Bishop, R. C., Hanemann, W. M., Kanninen, B. J., Krosnick, J. A., Morey, E. R., & Tourangeau, R. (2016). On the adequacy of scope test results: Comments on Desvousges, Mathews, and Train. Ecological Economics, 130, 356-360.
- Harbridge, L., Krosnick, J. A., and Wooldridge, J. M. (2016). Presidential approval and gas prices: Sociotropic or pocketbook influence? In Krosnick, J. A., Chiang, I.-C., & Stark, T. (Eds.), Political Psychology: New Explorations. Psychology Press. New York, New York.
- Krosnick, J. A., Stark, T. H., & Chiang, I.-C. (2016). The two core goals of political psychology. In Krosnick, J. A., Chiang, I.-C., & Stark, T. (Eds.), Political Psychology: New Explorations. Psychology Press. New York, New York.
- MacInnis, B., & Krosnick, J. A. (2016). The impact of candidates' statements about global warming on electoral success in 2008 to 2015: Evidence Using Five Methodologies. In Krosnick, J. A., Chiang, I.-C., & Stark, T. (Eds.), Political Psychology: New Explorations. Psychology Press. New York, New York.
- MacInnis, B., & Krosnick, J. A. (2016). Trust in scientists' statements about the environment and American public opinion on global warming. In Krosnick, J. A., Chiang, I.-C., & Stark, T. (Eds.), Political Psychology: New Explorations. Psychology Press. New York, New York.
- Miller, J. M., Krosnick, J. A., & Fabrigar, L. R. (2016). The origins of policy issue salience: Personal and national importance impact on behavioral, cognitive, and emotional issue engagement. In Krosnick, J. A., Chiang, I.-C., & Stark, T. (Eds.), Political Psychology: New Explorations. Psychology Press. New York, New York.
- Miller, J. M., Krosnick, J. A., Holbrook, A., Tahk, A., & Dionne, L. (2016). The impact of policy change threat on financial contributions to interest groups. In Krosnick, J. A., Chiang, I.-C., & Stark, T. (Eds.), Political Psychology: New Explorations. Psychology Press. New York, New York.
- Thomas, R. K., Krosnick, J. A., Shook, N. J., & Chiang, I.-C. (2016). "Forever changed?" Some surprising findings about U.S. Public Opinion after the attacks of 9/11/2001 on the U.S. In Krosnick, J. A., Chiang, I.-C., & Stark, T. (Eds.), Political Psychology: New Explorations. Psychology Press. New York, New York.
- Visser, P. S., Krosnick, J. A., & Norris, C. J. (2016). Attitude importance and attitude-relevant knowledge: Motivator and enabler. In Krosnick, J. A., Chiang, I.-C., & Stark, T. (Eds.), Political Psychology: New Explorations. Psychology Press. New York, New York.
- Bishop, R.C., Boyle, K. J., Carson, R. T., Chapman, D., Hanemann, W. M., Kanninen, B., Kopp, R. J., Krosnick, J. A., List, J., Meade, N., Paterson, R., Presser, S., Smith, V. K., Tourangeau, R., Welsh, M., Wooldridge, J.M., DeBell, M., Donovan, C., Konopka, M., & Scherer, N. (2017). Putting a value on injuries to natural assets: The BP oil spill. Science, 356, 253-254.
- Howe, L. C., & Krosnick, J. A. (2017). Attitude strength. Annual Review of Psychology, 68, 327-351.
- Krosnick, J. A., Malhotra, N., Mo, C. H., Bruera, E. F., Chang, L., Pasek, J., & Thomas, R. K. (2017). Perceptions of health risks of cigarette smoking: A new measure reveals widespread misunderstanding. PLoS ONE, 12(8): e0182063 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0182063>.
- Lundberg, K. B., Payne, B. K., Pasek, J., & Krosnick, J. A. (2017). Racial attitudes predicted changes in ostensibly race-neutral political attitudes under the Obama administration. Political Psychology, 38, 313-330.

- Stark, T. H., & Krosnick, J. A. (2017). GENSI: A new graphical tool to collect ego-centered network data. Social Networks, 48, 36-45.
- MacInnis, B., Krosnick, J. A., Ho, A. S., & Cho, M-J. (2018). The accuracy of measurements with probability survey samples: Replication and extension. Public Opinion Quarterly, 82, 707-744.
- DeBell, M., Krosnick, J. A., Gera, K., Yeager, D., & MacDonald, M. (in press). The turnout gap in surveys: Explanations and solutions. Sociological Methods and Research.
- Kim, N., Krosnick, J. A., & Lelkes, Y. (in press). Race of interviewer effects in telephone surveys preceding the 2008 U.S. Presidential elections. International Journal of Public Opinion Research.
- Silber, H., Stark, T. H., Krosnick, J. A., & Blom, A. G. (in press). Multi-national study of questionnaire design. In Johnson, T., Dorer, B. Stoop, I., & Pennell, B-E. (Eds.), Advances in Comparative Survey Methods: Multicultural, Multinational and Multiregional (3MC) Contexts. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Stark, T. H., Silber, H., Krosnick, J. A., Blom, A. G., Aoyagi, M., Belchior, A., Bosnjak, M., Clement, S. L., John, M., Jónsdóttir, G. A., Lawson, K., Lynn, P., Martinsson, Shamshiri-Petersen, D., Tvinnereim, E., Yu, R. (in press). Generalization of classic question order effects across cultures. Sociological Methods and Research.
- Other Reports and Publications
- Telhami, S., & Krosnick, J. A. (1989). American sentiment on Israeli-Palestinian fight: No favorites; Just make peace. Op-ed article in The Los Angeles Times, March 14, 1989. (Reprinted in the Columbus Dispatch, March 17, 1989)
- Krosnick, J. A. (1990). The uses and abuses of public opinion polls: The case of Louis Harris and Associates. Chronicles, 14, 47-49.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1990). The impact of satisficing on survey data quality. In Proceedings of the Bureau of the Census 1990 Annual Research Conference (pp. 835-845). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Smith, W. R., Culpepper, I. J., & Krosnick, J. A. (1992). The impact of question order on cognitive effort in survey responding. In Proceedings of the Sixth National Conference on Undergraduate Research. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Hermann, M. G. (1993). Report on the 1991 Ohio State University Summer Institute in Political Psychology. Political Psychology, 14, 363-373.
- Carson, R. T., Hanemann, W. M., Kopp, R. J., Krosnick, J. A., Mitchell, R. C., Presser, S., Ruud, P. A., & Smith, V. K. (1994). Prospective interim lost use value due to DDT and PCB contamination in the Southern California Bight. La Jolla, CA: Natural Resource Damage Assessment.
- Carson, R. T., Conaway, M. B., Hanemann, W. M., Krosnick, J. A., Martin, K. M., McCubbin, D. R., Mitchell, R. C., Presser, S. (1995). The value of preventing oil spill injuries to natural resources along California's central coast. La Jolla, CA: Natural Resource Damage Assessment.
- Krosnick, J. A., Visser, P. S., & Holbrook, A. L. (1998). American opinion on global warming: The impact of the Fall 1997 debate. Resources, 133, 5-9.

- Krosnick, J. A. (2000). The threat of satisficing in surveys: The shortcuts respondents take in answering questions. Survey Methods Newsletter, 20, 4-8.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2000). Americans are ready for the debacle to end. Newsday, December 7, A63-A66.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2001). The psychology of voting. The Psychology Place.
<http://www.psychplace.com/editorials/krosnick/krosnick1.html>.
- Green, M. C., & Krosnick, J. A. (2001). Comparing telephone and face-to-face interviewing in terms of data quality: The 1982 National Election Studies Method Comparison Project. In D. O'Rourke (Ed.), Health survey research methods. Hyattsville, Maryland: Department of Health and Human Services. DHHS Publication No. (PHS) 01-1013.
- Silver, M. D., & Krosnick, J. A. (2001). Optimizing survey measurement accuracy by matching question design to respondent memory organization. In Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology Research Conference, 2001. NTIS: PB2002-100103. <http://www.fcsm.gov/01papers/Krosnick.pdf>
- Krosnick, J. A. (2003). Introduction. In G. R. Walden, Survey research methodology, 1990-1999: An annotated bibliography. Westpoint, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2003). AAPOR in Nashville: The program for the 58th annual conference. AAPOR News, 31, 1, 3.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2003). Response rates, Huffington, and More: Reflections on the 58th annual conference. AAPOR News, 31, 1, 4-5.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2003). Proceedings of the fifty-eighth annual conference of the American Association for Public Opinion Research. Public Opinion Quarterly.
- Fiorina, M., & Krosnick, J. A. (2004). The Economist/YouGov Internet Presidential poll.
<http://www.economist.com/media/pdf/Paper.pdf>.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2006). What pilots could tell us. Op-ed essay in the New York Times, August 30, 2006.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2006). Are we really safer in the skies today? Aviation Law Prof Blog, September 5.
<http://lawprofessors.typepad.com/aviation/>
- Krosnick, J. A. (2006). In the voting booth, bias starts at the top. Op-ed in The New York Times, November 4, 2006.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2006). In the voting booth, name order can sway an election. Opinion essay in the "Perspective" section of The San Jose Mercury News, November 26, 2006.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2008). Evaluation of NORC's cognitive pretesting of new items for the General Social Survey. Report to the GSS Board of Overseers.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2008). Ballot changes cited in vote's discrepancy with polls: Clinton's favorable placement on ballots may account for part of poll mistakes. Opinion essay on ABCNews.com, January 9, 2008.
- Chapman, D. J., Bishop, R. C., Hanemann, W. M., Kanninen, B. J., Krosnick, J. A., Morey, E. R., & Tourangeau, R. 2009. Natural resource damages associated with aesthetic and ecosystem injuries to Oklahoma's Illinois River System and Tenkiller Lake. Boulder, CO: Stratus Consulting.

- Yeager, D. S., Krosnick, J. A., & Javitz, H.A. (2009). More on the problems with opt-in Internet surveys. Guest blog, “The Numbers”, <http://blogs.abcnews.com/thenumbers/2009/09/guest-blog-more-on-the-problems-with-optin-internet-surveys.html>.
- Yeager, D. S., & Krosnick, J. A. (2009). Were the benchmarks really wrong? Guest blog, “The Numbers”, <http://blogs.abcnews.com/thenumbers/2009/12/survey-accuracy-revisiting-the-benchmarks-.html>.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2010). The climate majority. Op-ed in the New York Times, June 9, 2010.
- Pasek, J., & Krosnick, J. A. (2010). Measuring intent to participate and participation in the 2010 census and their correlates and trends: Comparisons of RDD telephone and non-probability sample internet survey data. Survey Methodology Report #2010-15, Washington, DC: Statistical Research Division, U.S. Census Bureau. <http://www.census.gov/srd/papers/pdf/ssm2010-15.pdf>
- Berent, M. K., Krosnick, J. A., & Lupia, A. (2011). The quality of government records and “over-reporting” of registration and voting in surveys: Lessons from the 2008 ANES Panel Study’s registration and turnout validation exercises. Technical report, American National Election Studies. <http://electionstudies.org/resources/papers/nes012554.pdf>
- Krosnick, J. A., Kim, N., & MacInnis, B. (2014). What Americans think about climate change. Resources, 187: 40-44.
- Krosnick, J. A., Presser, S., Fealing, K. H., & Ruggles, S. with Vannette, D. L. (2015). The Future of Survey Research: Challenges and Opportunities. A report to the National Science Foundation. Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences Directorate, National Science Foundation.
- Bollen, K., Cacioppo, J. T., Kaplan, R. M., Krosnick, J. A., & Olds, J. L. (2015). Social, behavioral, and economic sciences perspectives on robust and reliable science. Report of the Subcommittee on Replicability in Science, Advisory Committee to the Directorate for Social, Behavioral, and Economics Sciences, National Science Foundation.

Book Reviews

- Krosnick, J. A. (1987). Review of **Political Cognition: The 19th Annual Carnegie Symposium on Cognition**, edited by R. R. Lau and D. O. Sears. American Political Science Review, 81, 266-268.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1988). Review of **The Choice Questionnaire**, by Peter Neijens. Public Opinion Quarterly, 52, 408-411.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1993). Review of **Measurement Errors in Surveys**, edited by P. P. Biemer, R. M. Groves, L. E. Lyberg, N. A. Mathiowetz, & S. Sudman. Public Opinion Quarterly, 57, 277-280.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1994). A new introduction to survey methods: Review of **Questionnaire Design, Interviewing and Attitude Measurement**, by A. N. Oppenheim. Contemporary Psychology, 39, 221-222.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1997). Review of **Thinking About Answers: The Application of Cognitive Processes to Survey Methodology**, by S. Sudman, N. M. Bradburn, and N. Schwarz, and **Answering Questions: Methodology for Determining Cognitive and Communicative Processes in Survey Research**, edited by N. Schwarz and S. Sudman. Public Opinion Quarterly, 61, 664-667.

Krosnick, J. A. (1998). Review of **What Americans Know about Politics and Why It Matters**, by M. X. Delli-Carpini and S. Keeter. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 559, 189-191.

Book Jacket Endorsement of Books

Callegaro, C., Manfreda, K. L., & Vehovar, V. (2015). Web Survey Methodology. London: Sage Publications.

Erikson, R. D., & Wlezien, C. (2012). The Timeline of Presidential Elections: How Campaigns Do (and Do Not) Matter. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Jussim, L. J. (2012). Social Perception and Social Reality: Why Accuracy Dominates Bias and Self-Fulfilling Prophecy. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Mutz, D. C., Brody, R. A., & Sniderman, P. M. (1996). Persuasion and Attitude Change. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Presentations

Milburn, M. A., & Krosnick, J. A. (1979). Social psychology applied to smoking and drug abuse prevention. Paper presented at the New England Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Framingham, Massachusetts.

Krosnick, J. A., McAlister, A. L., & Milburn, M. A. (1980). Research design for evaluating a peer leadership intervention to prevent adolescent substance abuse. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Montreal, Canada.

McAlister, A. L., Gordon, N. P., Krosnick, J. A., & Milburn, M. A. (1982). Experimental and correlational tests of a theoretical model for smoking prevention. Paper presented at the Society for Behavioral Medicine Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.

Kinder, D. R., Iyengar, S., Krosnick, J. A., & Peters, M. D. (1983). More than meets the eye: The impact of television news on evaluations of presidential performance. Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.

Krosnick, J. A. (1983). The relationship of attitude centrality to attitude stability. Paper presented at the American Sociological Association Annual Convention, Detroit, Michigan.

Alwin, D. F., & Krosnick, J. A. (1984). The measurement of values: A comparison of ratings and rankings. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Delavan, Wisconsin.

Schuman, H., Ludwig, J., & Krosnick, J. A. (1984). Measuring the salience and importance of public issues over time. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Delavan, Wisconsin.

Krosnick, J. A. (1984). Attitude extremity, stability, and self-report accuracy: The effects of attitude centrality. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Delavan, Wisconsin.

- Krosnick, J. A. (1984). The influence of consensus information on predictions of one's own behavior. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Toronto, Canada.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Alwin, D. F. (1986). An evaluation of a cognitive theory of response order effects in survey measurement. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, St. Petersburg, Florida.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1986). A new look at question order effects in surveys. Paper presented at the Symposium on Cognitive Sciences and Survey Research, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1987). The role of attitude importance in social evaluation: A study of policy preferences, presidential candidate evaluations, and voting behavior. Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A., Schuman, H., Carnot, C., Berent, M., & Boninger, D. (1987). Attitude importance and attitude accessibility. Paper presented at the Midwest Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Sedikides, C. (1987). Self-monitoring and self-protective biases in use of consensus information to predict one's own behavior. Paper presented at the Midwest Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A., Stephens, L., Jussim, L. J., & Lynn, A. R. (1987). Subliminal priming of affect and its cognitive consequences. Paper presented at the Midwest Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Alwin, D. F. (1987). Satisficing: A strategy for dealing with the demands of survey questions. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Hershey, Pennsylvania.
- Judd, C. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (1987). The structural bases of consistency among political attitudes: The effects of political expertise and attitude importance. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Annual Meeting, New York, New York.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Milburn, M. A. (1987). Psychological determinants of political opinionation. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1987). The role of attitude importance in social evaluation: A study of policy preferences, presidential candidate evaluations, and voting behavior. Paper presented at the Society for Experimental Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Charlottesville, Virginia.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1988). Psychological perspectives on political candidate perception: A review of research on the projection hypothesis. Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A., Boninger, D. S., Berent, M. K., & Carnot, C. G. (1988). The origins of attitude importance. Paper presented at the Midwest Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A., Carnot, C. G., Berent, M. K., & Boninger, D. S. (1988). An exploration of the relations among dimensions of attitude strength. Paper presented at the Midwest Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.

- Krosnick, J. A., Li, F., & Ashenhurst, J. (1988). Order of information presentation and the effect of base-rates on social judgments. Paper presented at the Midwest Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A., Berent, M. K., Carnot, C. G., & Boninger, D. S. (1988). Attitude importance and recall of attitude relevant information. Paper presented at the Midwest Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Carnot, C. G. (1988). A comparison of two theories of the origins of political attitude strength. Paper presented at the Midwest Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Alwin, D. F. (1988). The stability of political attitudes across the life span. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Toronto, Canada.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Carnot, C. G. (1988). Identifying the foreign affairs attentive public: A comparison of competing theories. Paper presented to the Mershon Center Seminar on Foreign Policy Decision Making, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
- Alwin, D. F., & Krosnick, J. A. (1988). The reliability of attitudinal survey data. Paper presented at the International Conference on Social Science Methodology, Dubrovnik, Yugoslavia.
- Alwin, D. F., & Krosnick, J. A. (1988). Aging, cohort stability, and change in socio-political attitudes: Exploring the generational-persistence model. Paper presented at the International Society of Political Psychology Annual Meeting, Secaucus, New Jersey.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Kinder, D. R. (1988). Altering the foundations of popular support for the president through priming: Reagan, the Iran-Contra affair, and the American public. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Weisberg, H. F. (1988). Liberal/conservative ideological structures in the mass public: A study of attitudes toward politicians and social groups. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1988). Government policy and citizen passion: A study of issue publics in contemporary America. Paper presented at the Shambaugh Conference on Communication, Cognition, Political Judgment, and Affect, Iowa City, Iowa.
- Berent, M. K., Krosnick, J. A., & Boninger, D. S. (1989). Attitude importance and the valenced recall of relevant information. Paper presented at the Midwest Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Betz, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (1989). Can people detect the affective tone of subliminally presented stimuli? Paper presented at the Midwest Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Berent, M. K. (1989). Age-related changes in peer and parental influence on heavy television viewing among children and adolescents. Paper presented at the Midwest Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Alwin, D. F., & Krosnick, J. A. (1989). The reliability of attitudinal survey data. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, St. Petersburg, Florida.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1989). The implications of social psychological findings on compliance for recruiting survey respondents. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, St. Petersburg, Florida.

- Telhami, S., & Krosnick, J. A. (1989). Public attitudes and American policy toward the Arab-Israeli conflict. Paper presented at the International Society of Political Psychology Annual Meeting, Israel.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Alwin, D. F. (1989). Symbolic versus non-symbolic political attitudes: Is there a distinction? Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Atlanta, Georgia.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1989). The impact of cognitive sophistication and attitude importance on response order effects and question order effects. Paper presented at the conference entitled Order effects in social and psychological research, Nags Head Conference Center, Kill Devil Hills, North Carolina.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1990). The impact of satisficing on survey data quality. Paper presented at the Annual Research Conference of the Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1990). New perspectives on survey questionnaire construction: Lessons from the cognitive revolution. Invited presentation at the 1990 Technical Conference of the United States General Accounting Office, College Park, Maryland.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1990). Americans' perceptions of presidential candidates: A test of the projection hypothesis. Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Berent, M. K. (1990). The impact of verbal labeling of response alternatives and branching on attitude measurement reliability in surveys. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Lancaster, Pennsylvania.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Alwin, D. F. (1990). The stability of political preferences: Comparisons of symbolic and non-symbolic attitudes. Paper presented at the International Society of Political Psychology Annual Meeting, Washington, D. C.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1990). Confounding of attitude objects with attitude measurement techniques in studies of political attitude stability. Paper presented at the Summer Institute in Survey Research Techniques, University of Michigan.
- Fabrigar, L. R., & Krosnick, J. A. (1991). The effect of question order and attitude importance on the false consensus effect. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Berent, M. K., & Krosnick, J. A. (1991). Attitude measurement reliability: The impact of verbal labeling of response alternatives and branching. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Lehman, D. R., Krosnick, J. A., West, R. L., & Li, F. (1991). The focus of judgment effect: A question wording effect due to hypothesis confirmation bias. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Krosnick, J. A., Boninger, D. S., Chuang, Y. C., & Carnot, C. G. (1991). Attitude strength: One construct or many related constructs? Paper presented at the Nags Head Conference on Attitude Strength, Nags Head, North Carolina.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1991). Research on attitude importance: A summary and integration. Paper presented at the Nags Head Conference on Attitude Strength, Nags Head, North Carolina.

- Krosnick, J. A., & Berent, M. K. (1991). Memory for political information: The impact of attitude importance on selective exposure, selective elaboration, and selective recall. Paper presented at the Society for Experimental Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Columbus, Ohio.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Brannon, L. A. (1992). The impact of war on the ingredients of presidential evaluations: George Bush and the Gulf conflict. Paper presented at the Conference on the Political Consequences of War, The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Berent, M. K., & Krosnick, J. A. (1992). The relation between attitude importance and knowledge structure. Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Smith, W. R., Culpepper, I. J., & Krosnick, J. A. (1992). The impact of question order on cognitive effort in survey responding. Paper presented at the Sixth National Conference on Undergraduate Research, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Brannon, L. A. (1992). The impact of war on the ingredients of presidential evaluations: George Bush and the Gulf conflict. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, St. Petersburg, Florida.
- Narayan, S. S., & Krosnick, J. A. (1992). Response effects in surveys as a function of cognitive sophistication. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Boninger, D. S., Krosnick, J. A., & Berent, M. K. (1992). Imagination, perceived likelihood, and self-interest: A path toward attitude importance. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Culpepper, I. J., Smith, W., & Krosnick, J. A. (1992). The impact of question order on satisficing in attitude surveys. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Berent, M. K., & Krosnick, J. A. (1992). Attitude importance, information accessibility, and attitude-relevant judgments. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Brannon, L. A. (1992). The impact of war on the ingredients of presidential evaluations: George Bush and the Gulf conflict. Paper presented at the International Society of Political Psychology Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California.
- Rahn, W. M., Krosnick, J. A., & Breuning, M. (1992). Rationalization and derivation processes in political candidate evaluation. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Brannon, L. A. (1992). Effects of knowledge, interest, and exposure on news media priming effects: Surprising results from multivariate analysis. Paper presented at the Society for Experimental Social Psychology Annual Meeting, San Antonio, Texas.
- Berent, M. K., & Krosnick, J. A. (1993). Attitude importance and selective exposure to attitude-relevant information. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Fabrigar, L. R., & Krosnick, J. A. (1993). The impact of personal and national importance judgments on political attitudes and behavior. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.

- Miller, J. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (1993). The effects of candidate ballot order on election outcomes. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Narayan, S. S., & Krosnick, J. A. (1993). Questionnaire and respondent characteristics that cause satisficing in attitude surveys. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Narayan, S. S., & Krosnick, J. A. (1993). Response effects in surveys as a function of cognitive sophistication. Paper presented at the American Psychological Society Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Smith, W. R., & Krosnick, J. A. (1993). Need for cognition, prior thought, and satisficing in attitude surveys. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Smith, W. R., & Krosnick, J. A. (1993). Cognitive and motivational determinants of satisficing in surveys. Paper presented at the American Psychological Society Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Berent, M. K., & Krosnick, J. A. (1994). Attitude importance and selective exposure to attitude-relevant information. Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Fabrigar, L. R., & Krosnick, J. A. (1994). The impact of attitude importance on consistency among attitudes. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1994). Survey methods and survey results: Overturning conventional wisdom. Paper presented to the American Marketing Association, Columbus Chapter.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Fabrigar, L. R. (1994). Attitude recall questions: Do they work? Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Danvers, Massachusetts.
- Miller, J. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (1994). Does accessibility mediate agenda-setting and priming? Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Smith, W. R., & Krosnick, J. A. (1994). Sources of non-differentiation and mental coin-flipping in surveys: Tests of satisficing hypotheses. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Danvers, Massachusetts.
- Visser, P. S., & Krosnick, J. A. (1994). Mail surveys for election forecasting? An evaluation of the Columbus Dispatch Poll. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Visser, P. S., Krosnick, J. A., & Curtin, M. (1994). Mail surveys for election forecasting? Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Danvers, Massachusetts.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Brannon, L. A. (1995). News media priming and the 1992 U.S. presidential election. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Cornet, P. J. (1995). Attitude importance and attitude change revisited: Shifts in attitude stability and measurement reliability across a presidential election campaign. Paper presented at the American Psychological Society Annual Meeting, New York, New York.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Fabrigar, L. R. (1995). Designing rating scales for effective measurement in surveys. Invited address at the International Conference on Survey Measurement and Process Quality, Bristol, England.

- Krosnick, J. A., Narayan, S. S., & Smith, W. R. (1995). The causes of survey satisficing: Cognitive skills and motivational factors. Paper presented at the Midwest Association for Public Opinion Research, Chicago, Illinois.
- Miller, J. M., Fabrigar, L. R., & Krosnick, J. A. (1995). Contrasting attitude importance and collective issue importance: Attitude properties and consequences. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Miller, J. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (1995). Ballot order effects on election outcomes. Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Miller, J. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (1995). Mediators and moderators of news media priming: It ain't accessibility, folks. Paper presented at the International Society of Political Psychology Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C.
- Narayan, S. S., & Krosnick, J. A. (1995). Education moderates response effects in surveys. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida.
- Smith, W. R., & Krosnick, J. A. (1995). Mental coin-flipping and non-differentiation in surveys: Tests of satisficing hypotheses. Invited address at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Visser, P. S., & Krosnick, J. A. (1995). The relation between age and susceptibility to attitude change: A new approach to an old question. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Visser, P. S., & Krosnick, J. A. (1995). Mail surveys win again: Some explanations for the superior accuracy of the Columbus Dispatch poll. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida.
- Ankerbrand, A. L., Krosnick, J. A., Cacioppo, J. T., & Visser, P. S. (1996). Candidate assessments and evaluative space. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Bizer, G. Y., & Krosnick, J. A. (1996). Attitude accessibility and importance revisited. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1996). Linking survey question structure to data quality: The impact of no-opinion options. Paper presented at the conference on "Quality Criteria in Survey Research," sponsored by the World Association for Public Opinion Research, Cadenabbia, Italy.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Brannon, L. A. (1996). News media priming during the 1992 U.S. presidential election campaign. Paper presented at the International Society of Political Psychology Annual Meeting, Vancouver, British Columbia.
- Miller, J. M., Fabrigar, L. R., & Krosnick, J. A. (1996). The roles of personal importance and national importance in motivating issue public membership. Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Miller, J. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (1996). Can issue public membership be triggered by the threat of a policy change? Paper presented at the International Society of Political Psychology Annual Meeting, Vancouver, British Columbia.

- Krosnick, J. A., & Visser, P. S. (1996). Changes in political attitude strength through the life cycle. Paper presented at the Society for Experimental Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Sturbridge, Massachusetts.
- Miller, J. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (1997). The impact of policy change threat on issue public membership. Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Ankerbrand, A. L., Krosnick, J. A., Cacioppo, J. T., Visser, P. S., & Gardner, W. (1997). Attitudes toward political candidates predict voter turnout. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Ankerbrand, A. L., & Krosnick, J. A. (1997). Response order effects in dichotomous questions: A social desirability explanation. Paper presented at the American Psychological Society Annual Meeting, Washington, DC.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1997). Miraculous accuracy in political surveys: The keys to success. Presentation in the Federation of Behavioral, Psychological, and Cognitive Sciences Seminar on Science and Public Policy, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1997). Non-attitudes and no-opinion filters. Paper presented at the Conference on no opinion, instability, and change in public opinion research. University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1997). Attitude strength. Paper presented at the Conference on no opinion, instability, and change in public opinion research. University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands.
- Bizer, G. Y., & Krosnick, J. A. (1998). The relation between attitude importance and attitude accessibility. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Holbrook, A., Krosnick, J. A., Carson, R. T., & Mitchell, R. C. (1998). Violating conversational conventions disrupts cognitive processing of survey questions. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, St. Louis, Missouri.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1998). Applying stated preference methods to assessing the value of public goods. Paper presented at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Application of Stated Preference Methods to Resource Compensation Workshop, Washington, DC.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1998). Implications of psychological research on justice and compensation for handling of natural resource damage cases. Paper presented at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Application of Stated Preference Methods to Resource Compensation Workshop, Washington, DC.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1998). Acquiescence: How a standard practice in many survey organizations compromises data quality. Paper presented at the conference on "Quality Criteria in Survey Research," sponsored by the World Association for Public Opinion Research, Cadenabbia, Italy.
- Krosnick, J. A., Lacy, D., & Lowe, L. (1998). When is environmental damage Americans' most important problem? A test of agenda-setting vs. the issue-attention cycle. Paper presented at the International Society of Political Psychology Annual Meeting, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.
- Visser, P. S., Krosnick, J. A., Marquette, J., & Curtin, M. (1998). Improving election forecasting: Allocation of undecided respondents, identification of likely voters, and response order effects. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, St. Louis, Missouri.

- Krosnick, J. A. (1998). The impact of science on public opinion: How people judge the national seriousness of global warming and form policy preferences. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1998). Response choice order and attitude reports: New evidence on conversational conventions and information processing biases in voting and in election forecasting polls. Paper presented at the Society of Experimental Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Lexington, Kentucky.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1998). The impact of the Fall 1997 debate about global warming on American public opinion. Paper presented at Resources for the Future, Washington, D.C.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1998). What the American public believes about global warming: Results of a national longitudinal survey study. Paper presented at the Amoco Public and Government Affairs and Government Relations Meeting, Woodruff, Wisconsin.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1998). What the American public believes about global warming: Results of a national longitudinal survey study. Paper presented in the Second Annual Carnegie Lectures on Global Environmental Change, Carnegie Museum of Natural History, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
- Green, M. C., & Krosnick, J. A. (1999). Survey satisficing: Telephone interviewing increases non-differentiation and no opinion responses. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Green, M. C., & Krosnick, J. A. (1999). Comparing telephone and face-to-face interviewing in terms of data quality: The 1982 National Election Studies Method Comparison Project. Paper presented at the Seventh Annual Conference on Health Survey Research Methods, Williamsburg, Virginia.
- Holbrook, A. L., Krosnick, J. A., Carson, R. T., & Mitchell, R. C. (1999). Violating conversational conventions disrupts cognitive processing of attitude questions. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, St. Petersburg, Florida.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1999). What happens when survey respondents don't try very hard? The notion of survey satisficing. Paper presented at the National Center for Social Research, London, United Kingdom.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1999). Satisficing: A single explanation for a wide range of findings in the questionnaire design literature. Paper presented at Linking the Path: A Conference for Analysts, Researchers, and Consultants, sponsored by the Gallup Organization, Lincoln, Nebraska.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1999). Methodology for the NAOMS Survey. Presentation at the Workshop on the Concept of the National Aviation Operational Monitoring System (NAOMS), Sponsored by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Alexandria, Virginia.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1999). Refining measurement of public values for policy-making: A test of contingent valuation procedures. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Atlanta, Georgia.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1999). The threat of satisficing in surveys: The shortcuts respondents take in answering questions. Paper presented at the National Center for Social Research Survey Methods Seminar on Survey Data Quality, London, England.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1999). Optimizing questionnaire design: How to maximise data quality. Paper presented at the National Center for Social Research Survey Methods Seminar on Survey Data Quality, London, England.

- Krosnick, J. A. (1999). The causes and consequences of no-opinion responses in surveys. Paper presented at the International Conference on Survey Nonresponse, Portland, Oregon.
- Miller, J. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (1999). The impact of threats and opportunities on political participation. Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- O'Muircheartaigh, C., Krosnick, J. A., & Helic, A. (1999). Middle alternatives, acquiescence, and the quality of questionnaire data. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, St. Petersburg, Florida.
- Bizer, G. Y., & Krosnick, J. A. (2000). The importance and accessibility of attitudes: Helping explain the structure of strength-related attitude attributes. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Holbrook, A. L., Krosnick, J. A., Visser, P. S., Gardner, W. L., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2000). The formation of attitudes toward presidential candidates and political parties: An asymmetric nonlinear process. Paper presented at the American Psychological Society Annual Meeting, Miami, Florida.
- Holbrook, A. L., Krosnick, J. A., Visser, P. S., Gardner, W. L., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2000). The formation of attitudes toward presidential candidates and political parties: An asymmetric, nonlinear, interactive process. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2000). Peering into the future of thinking and answering: A psychological perspective on internet survey respondents. Paper presented at *Survey Research: Past, Present, and Internet*, the 2000 Nebraska Symposium on Survey Research, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2000). The present and future of research on survey non-responses: Reflections on Portland '99 and beyond. Roundtable presentation at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Portland, Oregon.
- Holbrook, A. L., Krosnick, J. A., Moore, D. W., & Tourangeau, R. (2000). Response order effects in Gallup surveys: Linguistic structure and the impact of respondent ability, motivation, and task difficulty. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Portland, Oregon.
- Miller, J. M., Krosnick, J. A., & Lowe, L. (2000). The impact of policy change threat on financial contributions to interest groups. Paper presented at an invited conference, Political Participation: Building a Research Agenda, Center for the Study of Democratic Politics, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey.
- Miller, J. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (2000). Attitude change outside the laboratory: News media "priming" turns out not to be priming after all. Paper presented at the Society of Experimental Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Atlanta, Georgia.
- Saris, W., & Krosnick, J. A. (2000). The damaging effect of acquiescence response bias on answers to agree/disagree questions. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Portland, Oregon.
- Visser, P. S., & Krosnick, J. A. (2000). Exploring the distinct mechanisms through which strength-related attitude attributes confer resistance to attitude change. Paper presented at the Society for Personality and Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Nashville, Tennessee.
- Bizer, G. Y., & Krosnick, J. A. (2001). Need to evaluate and need for cognition predict political attitudes and behavior. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, Illinois.

- Krosnick, J. A. (2001). Who shapes public policy? Presentation made at the Annual Conference of the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, Columbus, Ohio.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Bizer, G. Y. (2001). Exploring the structure of strength-related attitude features: The relation between attitude importance and attitude accessibility. Paper presented at the Society for Personality and Social Psychology Annual Meeting, San Antonio, Texas.
- Krosnick, J. A., Visser, P. S., & Holbrook, A. L. (2001). Real-time attitude change outside the laboratory: The case of the 1997 national debate on global warming. Paper presented at the Society for Personality and Social Psychology Annual Meeting, San Antonio, Texas.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Miller, J. M. (2001). An unrecognized need for ballot reform: Effects of candidate name order. Paper presented at the conference entitled Election Reform: 2000 and Beyond, sponsored by the USC-Caltech Center for the Study of Law and Politics and the Jesse M. Unruh Institute of Politics, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California.
- Miller, J. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (2001). What motivates political cognition and behavior? Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Green, M. C., Krosnick, J. A., & Holbrook, A. L. (2001). Experimental comparisons of the quality of data obtained from face-to-face and telephone surveys. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Montreal, Canada.
- Silver, M. D., & Krosnick, J. A. (2001). An experimental comparison of the quality of data obtained in telephone and self-administered mailed surveys with a listed sample. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Montreal, Canada.
- Chang, L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2001). The representativeness of national samples: Comparisons of an RDD telephone survey with matched Internet surveys by Harris Interactive and Knowledge Networks. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Montreal, Canada.
- Chang, L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2001). The accuracy of self-reports: Comparisons of an RDD telephone survey with Internet Surveys by Harris Interactive and Knowledge Networks. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Montreal, Canada.
- O'Muircheartaigh, C., & Krosnick, J. A. (2001). A cross-national comparison of middle alternatives, acquiescence, and the quality of questionnaire data. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Montreal, Canada.
- Marquette, J., Green, J., & Krosnick, J. A. (2001). Experimental analysis of the accuracy of pre-election vote choice reports. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Montreal, Canada.
- Holbrook, A. L., Krosnick, J. A., Carson, R. T., & Mitchell, R. C. (2001). Violating conversational conventions disrupts cognitive processing of attitude questions. Paper presented at the 2001 Fifth Tri-Annual UC Berkeley Invitational Choice Symposium, Pacific Grove, California.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2001). Americans' perceptions of the health risks of cigarette smoking: A new opportunity for public education. Paper presented at the invited conference "Survey Research on Household Expectations and Preferences," Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

- McCready, W., Skitka, L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2001). Using a web-enabled national panel to conduct social psychological experiments. Workshop presented at the Society of Experimental Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Spokane, Washington.
- Krosnick, J. A., Courser, M., Mulligan, K., & Chang, L. (2001). Exploring the determinants of vote choices in the 2000 Presidential election: Longitudinal analyses to document causality. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California.
- Silver, M. D., & Krosnick, J. A. (2001). Optimizing survey measurement accuracy by matching question design to respondent memory organization. Paper presented at the Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology Research Conference, Arlington, Virginia.
- Krosnick, J. A., Courser, M., Mulligan, K., & Chang, L. (2002). Exploring the causes of vote choice in the 2000 Presidential election: Longitudinal analyses to document the causal determinants of candidate preferences. Paper presented at a conference entitled "Assessing the Vitality of Electoral Democracy in the U.S.: The 2000 Election," The Merhson Center, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
- Miller, J. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (2002). Mediators and moderators of news media agenda-setting. Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Shaeffer, E. M., Krosnick, J. A., & Holbrook, A. L. (2002). Assessing the efficacy of object rankings following ratings. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Lampron, S., Krosnick, J. A., Petty, R. E., & See, M. (2002). Self-interest, values, involvement, and susceptibility to attitude change. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2002). Comments on Baruch Fischhoff's "Environmental Risk: What's Worth Knowing – and Saying?" Paper presented at the 2nd Annual Public Policy Symposium, "Responding to Contemporary Environmental Risks." Sponsored by the Ohio State University Environmental Policy Initiative, Fischer College of Business, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
- Thomas, R. K., Uldall, B. R., & Krosnick, J. A. (2002). More is not necessarily better: Effects of response categories on measurement stability and validity. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, St. Petersburg, Florida.
- Uldall, B. R., Thomas, R. K., & Krosnick, J. A. (2002). Reliability and validity of web-based surveys: Effects of response modality, item format, and number of categories. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, St. Petersburg, Florida.
- Shook, N., Krosnick, J. A., & Thomas, R. K. (2002). Following the storm: Public opinion changes and political reactions in surveys. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, St. Petersburg, Florida.
- Chang, L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2002). Comparing self-administered computer surveys and auditory interviews: An experiment. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, St. Petersburg, Florida.
- Silver, M. D., & Krosnick, J. A. (2002). Optimizing survey measurement accuracy by matching question design to respondent memory organization. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, St. Petersburg, Florida.

- Krosnick, J. A., Visser, P. S., Holbrook, A. L., & Berent, M. K. (2002). Challenging the common-factor model of strength-related attitude attributes: Contrasting the antecedents and consequences of attitude importance and attitude-relevant knowledge. Paper presented at the General Meeting of the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology, San Sebastian, Spain.
- Krosnick, J. A., Miller, J. M., & Tichy, M. P. (2002). An unrecognized need for ballot reform: Effects of candidate name order. Paper presented at the International Society for Political Psychology Annual Meeting, Berlin, Germany.
- Chang, L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2002). RDD telephone vs. Internet survey methodology for studying American presidential elections: Comparing sample representativeness and response quality. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Bizer, G. Y., Krosnick, J. A., Holbrook, A. L., Petty, R. E., Rucker, D. D., & Wheeler, S. C. (2002). The impact of personality on electoral behavior and cognition: A study of need for cognition and need to evaluate. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Krosnick, J. A., Visser, P. S., & Holbrook, A. L. (2002). Social psychology under the microscope: Do classic experiments replicate when participants are representative of the general public rather than convenience samples of college students? Paper presented at the Society of Experimental Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Columbus, Ohio.
- Visser, P. S., Krosnick, J. A., Simmons, J. (2002). Distinguishing the cognitive and behavioral consequences of attitude importance and certainty. Paper presented at the Society of Experimental Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Columbus, Ohio.
- Chang, L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2002). RDD telephone vs. Internet survey methodology for studying American presidential elections: Comparing sample representativeness and response quality. Invited presentation at Westat, Rockville, Maryland.
- Chang, L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2002). Comparing the quality of data obtained from telephone and Internet surveys: Field and laboratory experiments. Invited paper presented at the FCSM Statistical Policy Seminar "Challenges to the Federal Statistical System in Fostering Access to Statistics." Bethesda, Maryland.
- Lampron, S. F., Krosnick, J. A., Shaeffer, E., Petty, R. E., & See, M. (2003). Different types of involvement moderate persuasion (somewhat) differently: Contrasting outcome-based and value-based involvement. Paper presented at the Society for Personality and Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Los Angeles, California.
- Visser, P. S., & Krosnick, J. A. (2003). Attitude strength: New insights from a life-course development perspective. Paper presented at the Society for Personality and Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Los Angeles, California.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2003). Basic methodological work for and in repeated cross-sectional and longitudinal surveys: A few thoughts. Paper presented at the National Science Foundation Workshop on Repeated Cross-sectional and Longitudinal Surveys, Arlington, Virginia.
- Pfent, A. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (2003). Rationalization of presidential candidate preferences. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.

- Holbrook, A. L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2003). Meta-psychological and operative measures of psychological constructs: The same or different? Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A., Visser, P. S., & Holbrook, A. L. (2003). Social psychology under the microscope: Do classic experiments replicate when participants are representative of the general public rather than convenience samples of college students? Invited presentation at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Saris, W. E., Krosnick, J. A., & Shaeffer, E. M. (2003). Comparing the quality of agree/disagree and balanced forced choice questions via an MTMM experiment. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Anand, S., & Krosnick, J. A. (2003). Satisficing in attitude surveys: The impact of cognitive skills and motivation on response effects. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Bizer, G. Y., Krosnick, J. A., Holbrook, A. L., Petty, R. E., Rucker, D. D., & Wheeler, S. C. (2003). The impact of personality on political beliefs, attitudes, and behavior: Need for cognition and need to evaluate. Paper presented at the American Psychological Society Annual Meeting, Atlanta, Georgia.
- Holbrook, A. L., Pfent, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2003). Response rates in recent surveys conducted by non-profits and commercial survey agencies and the news media. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Nashville, Tennessee.
- Shaeffer, E. M., Langer, G. E., Merkle, D. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (2003). A comparison of minimal balanced and fully balanced forced choice items. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Nashville, Tennessee.
- Pfent, A., Krosnick, J. A., & Courser, M. (2003). Rationalization and derivation processes in presidential elections: New evidence about the determinants of citizens' vote choices. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Nashville, Tennessee.
- Krosnick, J. A., Visser, P. S., & Holbrook, A. L. (2003). How to conceptualize attitude strength and how to measure it in surveys: Psychological perspectives. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Nashville, Tennessee.
- Chang, L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2003). Comparing data quality in telephone and internet surveys: Results of lab and field experiments. Invited paper presented at the American Statistical Association Annual Meetings, San Francisco, California.
- Pfent, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2003). Post-decisional dissonance reduction by a new method: Rationalization of political candidate choices illuminates the basic dynamics of decision-making. Paper presented at the Society of Experimental Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Fabrigar, L. R. (2003). "Don't know" and "no opinion" responses: What they mean, why they occur, and how to discourage them. Invited paper presented at the Basel Workshop on Item Non-response and Data Quality in Large Social Surveys, University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2003). Comments on theories of persuasion. Invited discussant at the conference entitled "Integrating Message Effects and Behavior Change Theories in Cancer Prevention, Treatment, and Care," Annenberg Public Policy Center, Annenberg School for Communication, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

- Krosnick, J. A. (2003). Survey methodology – scientific basis. Presentation at the National Aviation Operations Monitoring Service Working Group Meeting #1, Seattle, Washington.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2003). Survey methodology – NAOMS design decisions. Presentation at the National Aviation Operations Monitoring Service Working Group Meeting #1, Seattle, Washington.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2004). Survey methodology – scientific basis. Presentation at the National Transportation Safety Board, Washington, DC.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2004). Survey methodology – NAOMS design decisions. Presentation at the National Transportation Safety Board, Washington, DC.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2004). Public uses of the news media. Presentation as a part of the symposium “Politics and the media,” Social Sciences Resource Center, Stanford Libraries, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2004). Peering into the minds of respondents: The cognitive and social processes underlying answers to survey questions. Invited keynote lecture at the International Symposium in Honour of Paul Lazarsfeld, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (Belgium).
- Krosnick, J. A., Shook, N., & Thomas, R. K. (2004). Public opinion change in the aftermath of 9/11. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Holbrook, A. L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2004). Vote over-reporting: A test of the social desirability hypothesis. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Chang, L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2004). Assessing the accuracy of event rate estimates from national surveys. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Shaeffer, E. M., Lampron, S. F., Krosnick, J. A., Tompson, T. N., Visser, P. S., & Hanemann, W. M. (2004). A comparison of open vs. closed survey questions for valuing environmental goods. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Holbrook, A. L., Berent, M. K., Krosnick, J. A., Visser, P. S., & Boninger, D. S. (2004). Attitude importance and the accumulation of attitude-relevant knowledge in memory. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Chang, L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2004). Measuring the frequency of regular behaviors: Comparing the ‘typical week’ to the ‘past week.’ Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2004). What do Americans want government to do about global warming? Evidence from national surveys. Invited presentation at the “Workshop on Global Warming: The Psychology of Long Term Risk,” Cooperative Institute for Climate Science, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Malhotra, N. (2004). The causes of vote choice in the 2004 American Presidential Election: Insights from the 2004 YouGov surveys. Paper presented at the conference “The 2004 American Presidential Election: Voter Decision-Making in a Complex World,” Stanford University, Stanford, California.

- Krosnick, J. A., Visser, P. S., & Holbrook, A. L. (2004). The impact of social psychological manipulations embedded in surveys on special populations. Paper presented at the Pacific Chapter of the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2005). The future of the American National Election Studies. Roundtable: The political psychology of surveys. Paper presented at the Midwestern Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Malhotra, N., & Krosnick, J. A. (2005). What motivated Americans' views of the candidates and vote preferences across the 2004 presidential campaign? Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Miami, Florida.
- Garland, P., Krosnick, J. A., & Clark, H. H. (2005). Does question wording sometimes send unintended signals about expected answers? Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Miami, Florida.
- Callegaro, M., De Keulenaer, F., Krosnick, J. A., & Daves, R. (2005). Interviewer effects in an RDD telephone pre-election poll in Minneapolis 2001: An analysis of the effects of interviewer race and gender. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Miami, Florida.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Rivers, D. (2005). Web survey methodologies: A comparison of survey accuracy. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Miami, Florida.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Rivers, D. (2005). Comparing major survey firms in terms of survey satisficing: Telephone and internet data collection. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Miami, Florida.
- Holbrook, A. L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2005). Vote over-reporting: Testing the social desirability hypothesis in telephone and internet surveys. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Miami, Florida.
- Anand, S., Krosnick, J. A., Mulligan, K., Smith, W., Green, M., & Bizer, G. (2005). Effects of respondent motivation and task difficulty on nondifferentiation in ratings: A test of satisficing theory predictions. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Miami, Florida.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2005). Thought piece on survey participation. Paper presented at the conference entitled "New Approaches to Understanding Participation in Surveys," Belmont Conference Center, Elkridge, Maryland.
- Malhotra, N., & Krosnick, J. A. (2005). Pilot test of new procedures for identifying new and emerging occupations and their places in the SOC: A study of biotechnology. Paper presented at the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, DC.
- Holbrook, A. L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2005). Do survey respondents intentionally lie and claim that they voted when they did not? New evidence using the list and randomized response techniques. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Washington, DC.
- Malhotra, N., & Krosnick, J. A. (2005). The determinants of vote choice in the 2004 U.S. Presidential Election. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Washington, DC.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2005). Effects of survey data collection mode on response quality: Implications for mixing modes in cross-national studies. Paper presented at the conference "Mixed Mode Data Collection in Comparative Social Surveys," City University, London, United Kingdom.

- Krosnick, J. A., & Malhotra, N. (2006). The impact of presidential job performance assessments on vote choices in 2004. Paper presented at the conference "The Wartime Election of 2004," Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
- Rabinowitz, J. L. & Krosnick, J. A. (2006). Investigating the discriminant validity of symbolic racism. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Palm Springs, California.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2006). An evaluation framework: Total survey error in research practice. Paper presented at the Survey Methods Symposium sponsored by Central Market Research and Insights, Microsoft, Redmond, Washington.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2006). Data quality from phone vs. internet surveys. Paper presented at the Survey Methods Symposium sponsored by Central Market Research and Insights, Microsoft, Redmond, Washington.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2006). The distinguishing characteristics of frequent survey participants. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2006). An overview of the mission of the American National Election Studies. Presentation at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2006). The use of the internet in valuation surveys. Presentation at the workshop "Morbidity and Mortality: How Do We Value the Risk of Illness and Death?", sponsored by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the National Center for Environmental Research, and the National Council on Economic Education, Washington, DC.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2006). What the American public thinks about climate change: Findings from a new Stanford/ABC/Time Magazine Survey. Presentation at the "California Climate Change Policy Workshop," sponsored by the Woods Institute for the Environment, California State Capital Building, Sacramento, California.
- Holbrook, A. L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2006). Vote over-reporting: A test of the social desirability hypothesis. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Bannon, B., Krosnick, J. A., & Brannon, L. (2006). News media priming: Derivation or rationalization? Paper presented at the American Political Science Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- Malhotra, N., Krosnick, J. S., & Thomas, R. (2006). The effect of polls on political behavior. Paper presented at the American Political Science Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2006). Doing social psychology that's relevant and valued and valuable. Paper presented at the Society of Experimental Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2006). Overview of the American National Election Studies: Lessons learned about the causes of voter turnout and candidate choice. Paper presented at the conference "The Psychology of Voting and Election Campaigns," Social Science Research Institute, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina.

- Krosnick, J. A. (2006). What Americans really think about climate change. Presentation to the Stanford Women's Club of the East Bay, Contra Costa County Library, Orinda, California.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2006). The impact of survey mode and the merging of face-to-face recruitment with Internet data collection. Paper presented at the 2006 Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology Statistical Policy Seminar, "Keeping Current: What We Know – What We Need to Learn." Washington, DC.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2006). Comparisons of the accuracy of information obtained by face-to-face, telephone, internet, and paper and pencil data collection. Paper presented at the Pacific Chapter of the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California.
- Bizer, G. Y., Krosnick, J. A., Holbrook, A. L., Wheeler, S. C., Rucker, D. D., & Petty, R. E. (2007). The impact of personality on political beliefs, attitudes, and behavior: Need for cognition and need to evaluate. Paper presented at the Society for Personality and Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Memphis, Tennessee.
- Sargent, M. J., Rabinowitz, J., Shull, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2007). Support for government efforts to promote racial equality: Effects of antigroup affect and perceptions of value violation. Paper presented at the Society for Personality and Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Memphis, Tennessee.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2007). Americans' beliefs about global climate change: New national survey findings. Paper presented at the American Association for the Advancement of Science Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2007). Comparisons of survey modes and a new hybrid. Paper presented at the American Association for the Advancement of Science Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California.
- Garland, P., & Krosnick, J. A. (2007). The impact of race on evaluations of artistic products: Evidence of 'ownership' bias among prejudiced whites. Paper presented at the National Conference of Black Political Scientists, Burlingame, California.
- Lupia, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2007). Remaking the American National Election Studies. Paper presented at the National Conference of Black Political Scientists, Burlingame, California.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2007). What Americans really think about climate change: Attitude formation and change in response to a raging scientific controversy. Presentation sponsored by the California Research Bureau at the California State House, Sacramento, California.
- Harbridge, L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2007). Presidential approval and gas prices: The Bush presidency in historical context. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research annual meeting, Garden Grove, California.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Smith, T. (2007). Proposing questionnaire design experiments for the General Social Survey. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research annual meeting, Garden Grove, California.
- Cote, F., Tahk, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2007). Comparing the validity of public predictions of changes in the economy: RDD telephone data vs. volunteer samples completing paper and pencil questionnaires. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research annual meeting, Garden Grove, California.

- Schneider, D., Krosnick, J. A., & Ophir, E. (2007). Ballot order effects in California from 1976 to 2006. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research annual meeting, Garden Grove, California.
- O'Muircheartaigh, C., Krosnick, J. A., & Dennis, J. M. (2007). Face-to-face recruitment of an Internet survey panel: Lessons from an NSF-sponsored demonstration project. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research annual meeting, Garden Grove, California.
- Malhotra, N., & Krosnick, J. A. (2007). The effect of survey mode and sampling on inferences about political attitudes and behavior: Comparing the 2000 and 2004 ANES to Internet surveys with non-probability samples. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research annual meeting, Garden Grove, California.
- Krosnick, J. A., Malhotra, N., & Miller, L. (2007). Survey mode in the 21st Century: Probability vs. non-probability samples of a nation's population. Paper presented at the conference entitled "Cyberinfrastructure and National Election Studies: The Wivenhoe House Conference." University of Essex, Colchester, UK.
- Pasek, J., & Krosnick, J. A. (2007). Trends over time in America: Probability/telephone vs. non-probability/internet. Paper presented at the conference entitled "Cyberinfrastructure and National Election Studies: The Wivenhoe House Conference." University of Essex, Colchester, UK.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2007). Methods and results from the New Scientist Survey on Climate Change Policy. Presentation at the National Press Club, Washington, DC.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2007). The ANES Recompetition and its Implications for the GSS recompetition. Presentation at the American Sociological Association annual meeting, New York, New York.
- Harder, J., & Krosnick, J. A., (2007). Causes of voter turnout: A social psychological perspective. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association annual meeting, San Francisco, California.
- Schneider, D., Berent, M. K., Thomas, R., & Krosnick, J. A. (2007). Measuring customer satisfaction and loyalty: Improving the 'net promoter' score. Paper presented at the World Association for Public Opinion Research annual meeting, Berlin, Germany.
- Cobb, C., & Krosnick, J. A. (2007). The impact of postdoc appointments on science and engineering career outcomes and job satisfaction. Paper presented at the conference "Using Human Resource Data", Science Resources Statistics Workshop, Washington, DC.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2007). Some of the lessons learned from analyses of data from the American National Election Studies. Presentation at a conference facilitating learning about the American National Election Studies by leading news media pollsters. Gallup World Headquarters, Washington, DC.
- Berent, M. K., & Krosnick, J. A. (2007). For example ... How different cue types in survey questions influence frequency. Pacific Association for Public Opinion Research, San Francisco, California.
- Schneider, D., Krosnick, J. A., Ofir, E., Milligan, C., Tahk, A. (2008). The psychology of voting: How and why the order of candidate names on the ballot and election laws influence election outcomes. Society for Personality and Social Psychology annual meeting, Albuquerque, New Mexico.
- Saller, R., & Krosnick, J. A. (2008). Modern democracy and the Roman Empire: Ancient perspectives on the 2008 elections. The Claremont Hotel, Berkeley, California.

- Pasek, J., & Krosnick, J. A. (2008). Marketing of political candidates and voter choice. Paper presented at the Association for Consumer Research Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California.
- Breent, M. K., & Krosnick, J. A. (2008). For example ... How different example types in online surveys influence frequency estimates. Paper presented at the General Online Research 2008 Conference, Hamburg, Germany.
- Bowen, K., Visser, P., Krosnick, J. A., & Anand, S. (2008). Embedded attitudes: How social network features regulate individual-level attitude strength. Paper presented at the Association for Psychological Science Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Pasek, J., DeBell, M., & Krosnick, J. A. (2008). Measuring voters' values in the American National Election Studies. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Malhotra, N., Yee, N., Krosnick, J. A., Scott, A., Thomas, R. K., Anand, S., & Chang, L. (2008). Response order effects in rating scales. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Berent, M., & Krosnick, J. A. (2008). "For example": How different example types in online surveys influence frequency estimates. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Blocksom, D. T., Schneider, D., & Krosnick, J. A. (2008). Moderators of the name-order effect: The 2004 Presidential Election in Ohio. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Holbrook, A. L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2008). Results of the 2008 ANES voter turnout experiment. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Schneider, D., Berent, M. K., Thomas, R. K., & Krosnick, J. A. (2008). Measuring customer satisfaction and loyalty: improving the 'net-promoter' score. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Wang, R., & Krosnick, J. A. (2008). Comparing the results of probability and non-probability telephone and internet survey data. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Malhotra, N., & Krosnick, J. A. Perceptions of mass opinion and voting in presidential primaries. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Krosnick, J. A., Yeager, D., & Wang, R. (2008). The validity of political surveys with non-probability samples of respondents who volunteer to answer questions for money. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Pasek, J. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (2008). Studying trends in public opinion over time with probability sample surveys and surveys of people who volunteer to do surveys for money. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Thomas, R. K., & Krosnick, J. A. (2008). Number of response categories and scale compression: Effects on validity and reliability. Paper presented at the Seventh International Conference on Social Science Methodology – RC33 – Logic and Methodology in Sociology, Naples, Italy.

- Malka, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2009). Conservative-liberal self-label and responsiveness to ideological cues. Paper presented at the Society for Personal and Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Tampa, Florida.
- Cobb, C., & Krosnick, J. A. (2009). Experimental test of the accuracy of proxy reports compared to target report with third-party validity. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Hollywood, Florida.
- Yeager, D., & Krosnick, J. A. (2009). Does weighting improve the accuracy of data from non-probability internet survey panels of people who volunteer to do surveys for money? Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Hollywood, Florida.
- Payne, K., Lelkes, Y., Krosnick, J. A., Akhtar, O., Pasek, J., & Thompson, T. (2009). The effect of implicit prejudice on vote choice during the 2008 Presidential election: Insights from the Associated Press-Yahoo! News-Stanford University study. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Hollywood, Florida.
- Pasek, J., Krosnick, J. A., Akhtar, O., Lelkes, Y., Payne, K., & Thompson, T. (2009). A new approach to simultaneous modeling of the causes of turnout and candidate choice with data collected before elections: Insights from the Associated Press-Yahoo! News-Stanford University study. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Hollywood, Florida.
- Yeager, D., & Krosnick, J. A. (2009). Comparison study of probability and non-probability sample surveys conducted by Internet and face to face. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Hollywood, Florida.
- DeBell, M., Krosnick, J. A., Malka, A., Ackermann, A., & Turakhia, C. (2009). Assessing the FFISP's representative of the American adult population. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Hollywood, Florida.
- Krosnick, J. A., Ackermann, A., DeBell, M., Malka, A., & Turakhia, C. (2009). A comparison of behavioral and attitudinal findings from the FFISP with those of major national surveys. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Hollywood, Florida.
- Ackermann, A., Krosnick, J. A., Turakhia, C., DeBell, M., Malka, A., & Jarmon, R. (2009). Lessons learned about how to accomplish effective in-person recruitment of a web-equipped survey panel. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Hollywood, Florida.
- Sakshaug, J., Tourangeau, R., Krosnick, J. A., Ackerman, A., Malka, A., DeBell, M., & Turakhia, C. (2009). Dispositions and outcome rates in the Face-to-face Internet Survey Platform (the FFISP). Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Hollywood, Florida.
- Lelkes, Y., Krosnick, J. A., Akhtar, O., Pasek, J., & Thompson, T., & Payne, K. (2009). An exploration of the forces driving vote choices in the 2008 American Presidential Election: Insights from the Associated Press-Yahoo! News-Stanford University study. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Hollywood, Florida.
- Light, A. E., Visser, P. S., Krosnick, J. A., & Anand, S. (2009). Variability without and within: Self-concept clarity and varied social networks. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.

- Krosnick, J. A., Ackermann, A., Malka, A., Yeager, D., Sakshaug, J., Tourangeau, R., DeBell, M., & Turakhia, C. (2009). Creating the face-to-face recruited internet survey platform (FFRISP). Paper presented at the Third Annual Workshop on Measurement and Experimentation with Internet Panels: Innovative Features of Internet Interviewing, Santpoort Noord, the Netherlands.
- Krosnick, J. A., Achermann, A., Malka, A., Yeager, D., Sakshaug, J., Tourangeau, R., DeBell, M., & Turakhia, C. (2009). Creation of a new representative sample Internet survey panel via face-to-face recruitment and providing free computers to all respondents: Evaluation of the FFISP. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Toronto, Canada.
- Krosnick, J. A., Pasek, J., Tahk, A., Lelkes, Y., Payne, K., Tompson, T., & Akhtar, O. (2009). The 2008 American Presidential election: An exploration of the forces driving vote choices. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Toronto, Canada.
- Krosnick, J. A., Lupia, A., & DeBell, M. (2009). The activities of the American National Election Studies. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Toronto, Canada.
- Yeager, D., Krosnick, J. A., Holbrook, A. L., & Visser, P. S. (2010). Pulling social psychology out of the laboratory, kicking and screaming. Paper presented at the Society for Personality and Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Las Vegas, Nevada.
- Gross, W., & Krosnick, J. A. (2010). Issue publics and candidate evaluations: Explaining inconsistent results in the moderation of issue agreement by individual issue importance. Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meetings, Chicago, Illinois.
- Gross, W., Kropko, J., Krosnick, J. A., Macdonald, S. E., & Rabinowitz, G. (2010). The influence of personal importance in issue voting models. Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meetings, Chicago, Illinois.
- Kim, N., & Krosnick, J. A. (2010). Moderators of candidate name order effects. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Conference, Chicago, Illinois.
- DeBell, M., Villar, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2010). Measuring the number of land line and cellular telephones used for voice calls in households to properly weight RDD surveys for unequal probability of selection. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Conference, Chicago, Illinois.
- Pasek, J., DeBell, M., & Krosnick, J. A. (2010). Toward a standardization of survey weights: The American National Election Studies weighting system. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Conference, Chicago, Illinois.
- Lelkes, Y., Krosnick, J. A., Marx, D. M., Judd, C. M., & Park, B. (2010). Unmotivated anonymity: Social desirability, accuracy, and satisficing under conditions of anonymity. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Conference, Chicago, Illinois.
- Sood, G., Krosnick, J. A., & DeBell, M. (2010). Differences between confidentially and orally administered overt racism measures: Evidence from the 2008 ANES. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Conference, Chicago, Illinois.
- Tompson, T., Krosnick, J. A., Junius, D., & Pasek, J. (2010). Support for health care reform: It all depends on how you ask the question. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Conference, Chicago, Illinois.

- Pasek, J., Tompson, T., & Krosnick, J. A. (2010). Who supports health care reform? Explaining the determinants of support for various health care reforms. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Conference, Chicago, Illinois.
- Yeager, D. S., Carter, A., Tewoldemedhin, H., & Krosnick, J. A. (2010). Study of non-probability sample internet surveys' estimates of consumer product usage and demographic characteristics of consumer product users. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Conference, Chicago, Illinois.
- Berent, M. K., Krosnick, J. A., & DeBell, M. (2010). Confirming the validity of survey respondent reports of voter registration and turnout: Checking the records turns up surprisingly bad news. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Conference, Chicago, Illinois.
- Villar, A., Malka, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2010). Assessing the accuracy of the Face-to-Face Recruited Internet Survey Platform: A comparison of behavioral and health-related findings from the FFRISP with those of major national surveys. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Conference, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A., Malka, A., & Villar, A. (2010). Manipulation of public opinion on global warming: The impact of news media coverage and the weather. Paper presented at the International Society of Political Psychology Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California.
- Shockley, E., Krosnick, J. A., & Visser, P. S. (2010). The impact of aging on political ideology. Paper presented at the International Society of Political Psychology Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California.
- Yeager, D., Krosnick, J. A., Tewoldemedhin, H., & Carter, A. (2010). Evaluating non-probability sample internet surveys' estimates of consumer product usage and demographic characteristics of consumer product users: Do different panels produce the same results? Paper presented at the Fourth Annual Workshop on Measurement and Experimentation with Internet Panels: Innovative Features of Internet Interviewing, Noordwijk, the Netherlands.
- Krosnick, J. A., Tompson, T., & Villar, A. (2010). Change in public opinion about climate change 2006-2010: How trusted sources and personal experience combine. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Washington, DC.
- Gera, K. Yeager, D., Krosnick, J. A., DeBell, M., & McDonald, M. (2010). Comparing estimates of voter turnout from the American National Election Studies, the General Social Survey, and the Current Population Survey. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Washington, DC.
- Pasek, J., Krosnick, J. A., & Tompson, T. (2010). Taking a position on health care: Selfish, group interest, and sociotropic determinants of citizens' attitudes on proposals for health care reform. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Washington, DC.
- Sood, G., & Krosnick, J. A. (2010). The impact of satire in television news: Differential impact on the usual audience and on other viewers. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Washington, DC.
- Tahk, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2010). Do the news media shape how Americans think about politics? New statistical procedures cast new light on an old hypothesis. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Washington, DC.

- Kim, N., & Krosnick, J. A. (2010). Moderators of candidate name order effects. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Washington, DC.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2010). We just want to help: How social science can sometimes be successful and sometimes crash and burn when in the public spotlight. Paper presented at the Society of Experimental Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- Berent, M. K., Krosnick, J. A., & Lupia, A. (2011). Lying survey respondents or flawed government records? An examination of turnout over-reporting and vote validation in the 2008 ANES Panel Study. Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Cobb, C., Krosnick, J. A., & Bannon, B. (2011). Optimizing the design of a question intended to measure expected starting salary. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.
- MacInnis, B., & Krosnick, J. A. (2011). The persistence of American public opinion on climate policy. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Yeager, D. S., Larson, S., & Krosnick, J. A. (2011). Measuring Americans' issue priorities: A new version of the most important problem question reveals more concern about global warming and the environment. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2011). The stability of American public opinion on global warming: Towards explaining the existence beliefs trends. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Romano Bergstrom, J. C., Olmsted-Hawala, E. L., Rogers, W. A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2011). Age-related differences in reported computer and internet usage based on question type: 'A great deal' of variability. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Jans, M., Bergstrom, J. C., Ashenfelter, K. T., & Krosnick, J. A. (2011). Measuring user satisfaction in the lab: Questionnaire mode, physical location, and social presence concerns. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.
- MacInnis, B., & Krosnick, J. A. (2011). Complete satisficing in surveys: An exploratory investigation. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Yeager, D. S., & Krosnick, J. A. (2011). Does mentioning 'some people' and 'other people' in an attitude question improve measurement quality? Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Chang, L., Krosnick, J. A., & Tompson, T. (2011). The impact of healthcare utilization on satisfaction with health insurance plans. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Chang, L. & Krosnick, J. A. (2011). Assessing survey accuracy across multiple domains. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Pasek, J., & Krosnick, J. A. (2011). Measuring intent to participate and participation in the 2010 census and their correlates and trends: Comparisons of RDD telephone and non-probability sample internet survey data. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.

- Weiss, R., Krosnick, J. A., & Yeager, D. S. (2011). More comparisons of probability and non-probability sample internet surveys: The Dutch NOPVO study. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Gilbert, E., Allum, N., Villar, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2011). Do reluctant respondents provide poor data? Evidence from the Face-to-Face Recruited Internet Survey Platform (FFRISP). Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Lelkes, Y., & Krosnick, J. A. (2011). Measuring perceptions and probabilities: Verbal or numerical response options? Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Krosnick, J. A., MacInnis, B., & Villar, A. (2011). The impact of candidates' statements about climate change on electoral success in 2008 and 2010: Evidence using three methodologies. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Seattle, Washington.
- Berent, M. K., Krosnick, J. A., & Lupia, A. (2011). Measuring voter registration and turnout in surveys: Do official government records yield more accurate assessments? Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Seattle, Washington.
- Krosnick, J. A., MacInnis, B., & Villar, A. (2012). Polarization of opinions about global warming between 1997 and 2011: Appearances are sometimes misleading. Paper presented at the Society for Personality and Social Psychology Annual Meeting, San Diego, California.
- MacInnis, B., Krosnick, J. A., & Villar, A. (2012). Motivated social cognition in the realm of politics: The case of news media dissemination of information about climate change. Paper presented at the Society for Personality and Social Psychology Annual Meeting, San Diego, California.
- Villar, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2012). An investigation of nonresponse error due to breakoffs in telephone surveys. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Orlando, Florida.
- Anand, S., Krosnick, J. A., & Yeager, D. S. (2012). What number of scale points in an attitude question optimizes response validity and administrative practicality? Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Orlando, Florida.
- Kim, N., Lelkes, Y., & Krosnick, J. A. (2012). Race of interviewer effects in the 2008 Presidential election. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Orlando, Florida.
- Berent, M. K., Krosnick, J. A., & Lupia, A. (2012). Lying vs. fail-to-match: Self-reported turnout and validated turnout in the 2008-2009 ANES Panel Study. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Orlando, Florida.
- Young, C., Jackson, C., & Krosnick, J. A. (2012). Comparison of dual frame telephone and non-probability online panels regarding accuracy of political opinion polling. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Orlando, Florida.
- Callegaro, M., Villar, A., Krosnick, J. A., & Yeager, D. S. (2012). A systematic review of studies investigating the quality of data obtained with online panels. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Orlando, Florida.

- Weiss, R. J., Berent, M. K., Krosnick, J. A., & Lupia, A. (2012). Investigating automated coding of open-ended survey questions. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Orlando, Florida.
- Pasek, J., Sood, G., & Krosnick, J. A. (2012). A certain truth? How Americans received and perceived information about the Obama health care plan. Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Kropko, J., Gross, W., & Krosnick, J. A. (2012). Issue publics and candidate evaluations: Selecting the best fitting models of the moderation of issue agreement by individual issue importance. Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Pasek, J., Krosnick, J. A., & Tahk, A. M. (2012). Prevalence and moderators of the candidate name order effect: Evidence from all statewide general elections in California. Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- MacInnis, B., Krosnick, J. A., Suh, A., & Cho, Mu-Jung. (2013). Assessments of survey accuracy: A multimode national field experiment. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Santa Cruz, H., & Krosnick, J. A. (2013). Shocking misbehavior by face-to-face interviewers: The 2008 ANES office recognition questions. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Vannette, D., Krosnick, J. A. (2013). Mindful responding to questions: The dangers of survey satisficing. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Stark, T. H., Pasek, J., Thompson, T., & Krosnick, J. A. (2013). Measuring anti-Black racism in the U.S. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Kiley, J., Keeter, S., Frei, M., Motel, S., Christian, L.M., Dimock, M., McDonald, M. P., Berent, M., & Krosnick, J. A. (2013). Validating likely voter measures in 2012 pre-election polling. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts.
- MacInnis, B., Howe, L., Krosnick, J. A., Markowitz, E., & Socolow, R. (2013). Confidently uncertain: When expressing uncertainty enhances trust and persuasion. Paper presented at the Society of Experimental Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Berkeley, California.
- Silber, H., Krosnick, J. A., & Yeager, D. (2013). Replication of experimental results across telephone and internet survey panels. Paper presented at the Pacific Chapter of the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California. (Winner of Second Place in the PAPOR Student Paper Competition)
- Holbrook, A. L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2013). A new question sequence to measure voter turnout in telephone surveys: Results of an experiment in the 2006 ANES pilot study. Public Opinion Quarterly Special Issue Conference: Topics in Survey Measurement and Public Opinion. Barbara Jordan Conference Center, Washington, DC.
- Yeager, D., & Krosnick, J. A. (2014). Generalizability as a scientific integrity issue. Paper presented at the Association for Psychological Science Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California.

- Stark, T. H., & Krosnick, J. A. (2014). A new tool for ego-centered networks in online surveys. Paper presented at the European Congress of Methodology, Utrecht, The Netherlands.
- Stark, T. H., Krosnick, J. A., Pasek, J., & Tompson, T. (2014). Comparing measures of anti-Black racial prejudice. Paper presented at the Society for Personality and Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Austin, Texas.
- Stark, T. H., & Krosnick, J. A. (2014). A new tool for ego-centered networks. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Anaheim, California.
- Krosnick, J. A., & MacInnis, B. (2014). Public opinion on global warming: Contradictory results among surveys. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Anaheim, California.
- Silber, H., Krosnick, J. A., Stark, T. H., & Blom, A. G. (2014). Exact replication of question design experiments from Schuman and Presser. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Anaheim, California.
- Krosnick, J. A., Kim, S., & Berman, R. (2014). Testing the principles of optimal questionnaire design: Does a questionnaire supposedly designed better actually work better? Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Anaheim, California.
- Callegaro, M., Lavrakas, P. J., & Krosnick, J. A. The status of online panel research from a data quality perspective. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Anaheim, California.
- Pasek, J., Sood, G., & Krosnick, J. A. (2014). Certain gains in measurement of political knowledge (and misinformation). Paper presented at the International Communication Association Annual Meeting, Seattle, Washington.
- Krosnick, J. A., & MacInnis, B. (2014). How should Congressional representatives decide how to vote? A study of the American public's prescriptions. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association's Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C.
- Krosnick, J. A., & MacInnis, B. (2014). A new method for measuring public opinion in the States and causes of differences: The case of global warming. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association's Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2014). An overview of scientific integrity issues: Worse than you thought. Paper presented at the Society for Experimental Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Columbus, Ohio.
- Yeager, D., & Krosnick, J. A. (2014). An example of (partial) failure to replicate: How important (but not so new) lessons can be (re)learned from relentless pursuit of the ease of retrieval effect. Paper presented at the Society for Experimental Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Columbus, Ohio.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2015). Scientific integrity: The problem is much bigger than we think. Paper presented at the Society for Personality and Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Long Beach, California.
- Stark, T. H., & Krosnick, J. A. (2015). Measuring social networks in large-scale surveys: Challenges and practice of ego-centered and complete network approaches. Paper presented at the European Survey Research Association Annual Meeting, Reykjavik, Iceland.

- Srinivasan, R., Suh, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2015). Comparing direct and filtered frequency questions: Which produces more accurate measurements? Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Hollywood, Florida.
- Clement, S., & Krosnick, J. A. (2015). Does candidate order matter? Impact of matching ballot order on pre-election poll accuracy. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Hollywood, Florida.
- Stark, T. H., & Krosnick, J. A. (2015). A new tool to collect ego-centered network data in online surveys. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Hollywood, Florida.
- Vannette, D. L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2015). The effects and effectiveness of likely voter models in pre-election surveys. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Hollywood, Florida.
- Krosnick, J. A., MacInnis, B., & Villar, A. (2015). Does an introductory sentence in an opinion question cause acquiescence response bias? Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Hollywood, Florida.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2015). Ballot design: The impact of candidate name order. Paper presented at the Electoral Integrity Project Pre-APSA Workshop: What works? Strengthening Electoral Integrity. San Francisco, California.
- Silber, H., Stark, T. H., Blom, A. G. & Krosnick, J. A. (2016). Multi-national replication of experiments on acquiescence from Schuman and Presser. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Austin, Texas.
- Yang, S., Yeager, D. S., Krosnick, J. A., & Anand, S. (2016). Directly testing accepted wisdom regarding the validity of different scale lengths. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Austin, Texas.
- Kim, S., & Krosnick, J. A. (2016). Perceptions about scientific agreement, trust in scientists, and the American public's beliefs about global warming. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Austin, Texas.
- Yang, Y., Callegaro, M., Chin, K., Villar, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2016). Assessing the accuracy of 51 nonprobability online panels and river samples: A study of the Advertising Research Foundation 2013 online panel comparison experiment. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Austin, Texas.
- Silber, H., Stark, T., Blom, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2016). Do response effects generalize across countries? Paper presented at the Second International Conference on Survey Methods in Multinational, Multiregional, and Multicultural Contexts (3MC 2016), sponsored by the International Workshop on Comparative Survey Design and Implementation, Chicago, Illinois.
- Silber, H., Stark, T., Blom, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2016). Multi-national study of questionnaire design. Paper presented at the Second International Conference on Survey Methods in Multinational, Multiregional, and Multicultural Contexts (3MC 2016), sponsored by the International Workshop on Comparative Survey Design and Implementation, Chicago, Illinois.
- MacInnis, B., Anderson, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2016). How do Americans want their elected representatives to make laws? Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

- Kim, S., & Krosnick, J. A. (2016). An exploration of the effect of advertising: The mediating role of perceptions of social proof. Paper presented at the National Communication Association Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- Abeles, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2017). Communicating about climate change: Labels unwittingly signal opinion. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Annual Meeting, San Diego, California.
- Pasek, J., Stark, T., Krosnick, J. A., & Tompson, T. (2017). How would better knowledge influence support for the Affordable Care Act? A simulation and experiment. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Wu, J., Krosnick, J. A., & DeBell, M. (2017). Raking and weighting ANES Time Series. Poster presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Stark, T., Krosnick, J. A., Silber, H., & Blom, A. (2017). A test of generalization of classic question order effects in different cultures. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Lundmark, S., Azevedo, F., Krosnick, J. A., & Marcus, G. E. (2017). Evaluation of the impact of the response slide scales: Validity, cognitive effort, and moderation of experimental treatment effects. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- McLean, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2017). Accuracy of national and state polls in the 2016 election. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Krosnick, J. A., Cho, A., McLean, A., Middleton, C., Kay, D., Abruzzo, J., Munroe, J., & Carrington, M. (2017). Assessing the accuracy of pre-election polls: 2008-2012. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Abeles, A., Howe, L., Krosnick, J. A., & MacInnis, B. (2017). Misperceptions of public opinion: Americans underestimate belief in global warming. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- McLean, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2017). Discrepancies between 2016 pre-election polls and election outcomes: Electoral integrity failure? Paper presented at the pre-APSA workshop entitled "Protecting Electoral Security and Voting Rights: The 2016 U.S. Elections in Comparative Perspective." Sponsored by the Electoral Integrity Project, San Francisco, California.
- McLean, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2017). Fake news preceding the 2016 U.S. Presidential election: Non-scientific "surveys" masquerading as science. Paper presented at the pre-APSA Political Communication Preconference, sponsored by the Political Communication Section of the American Political Science Association, San Francisco, California.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2017). Conference goals. Workshop on Implicit Bias, National Science Foundation, Alexandria, Virginia.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2017). Critiques of implicit bias. Workshop on Implicit Bias, National Science Foundation, Alexandria, Virginia.

- Sekar, S., Krosnick, J. A., & MacInnis, B. (2018). Can we just skip doing surveys altogether? Comparing the accuracy of MRP and LAP to real survey data. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Denver, Colorado.
- Kephart, K., Henderson, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2018). To list or not to list, that is the question: An examination of existing research on the challenges and best practices of household rostering. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Denver, Colorado.
- Krosnick, J. A., Silber, H., Stark, T., & Blom, A. (2018). Generalization of classic response order effects across cultures. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Denver, Colorado.

Off-Campus Academic Colloquia

- | | |
|------|--|
| 1985 | State University of New York at Stony Brook, Department of Political Science.
Princeton University, Department of Sociology.
Princeton University, Department of Politics.
University of California at Berkeley, Department of Sociology.
Yale University, Department of Sociology.
Yale University, Department of Political Science.
Ohio State University, Department of Psychology.
University of Southern California, Annenberg School for Communication. |
| 1986 | University of Michigan, Department of Sociology. |
| 1987 | Yale University, Department of Psychology.
Yale University, Department of Political Science.
University of Michigan, Department of Sociology. |
| 1988 | University of Minnesota, Department of Political Science. |
| 1990 | University of Florida, Department of Psychology.
University of Florida, Bureau of Economic and Business Research.
Denison University, Department of Psychology. |
| 1991 | University of Michigan, Summer Institute in Survey Research Techniques. |
| 1992 | University of Michigan, Summer Institute in Survey Research Techniques.
University of Michigan, Department of Communication. |
| 1993 | University of Wisconsin, Departments of Psychology, Sociology, and Political Science.
University of Michigan, Summer Institute in Survey Research Techniques. |
| 1994 | Yale University, Department of Psychology.
University of Michigan, Research Center for Group Dynamics.
Cornell University, Peace Studies Center. |
| 1995 | University of Michigan, Summer Institute in Survey Research Techniques.
University of Minnesota, Department of Political Science. |
| 1996 | University of Pennsylvania, Annenberg School for Communication.
University of Chicago, Center for Decision Research.
Purdue University, Department of Psychology. |

- 1997 Stanford University, Department of Psychology.
University of California – Berkeley, Institute of Governmental Studies.
University of California – Berkeley, Institute of Personality and Social Research.
University of California – Irvine, Department of Social Sciences.
University of California – Los Angeles, Institute for Social Science Research.
University of California – Santa Barbara, Department of Psychology.
University of California – Santa Cruz, Board of Psychology.
Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences.
London School of Economics and Political Science, Methodology Institute.
- 1998 Arizona State University, Department of Psychology.
London School of Economics and Political Science, Methodology Institute.
University of Amsterdam, Department of Psychology.
Carnegie Mellon University, Center for the Integrated Study of the Human Dimensions of Global Change, Department of Engineering and Public Policy.
- 1999 University of Chicago, American Politics Workshop, Department of Political Science.
Indiana University, Departments of Political Science and Psychology.
University of Minnesota, Departments of Political Science and Psychology.
- 2000 University of California, Los Angeles, Department of Political Science.
University of Southern California, Jesse M. Unruh Institute of Politics.
University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research, Survey Research Center.
- 2001 The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, Menlo Park, California.
London School of Economics and Political Science, Methodology Institute.
Resources for the Future, Washington, DC.
- 2002 University of Colorado - Boulder, Department of Psychology.
University of Florida - Gainesville, Department of Psychology.
Stanford University, Department of Communication.
University of Chicago, Harris School of Public Policy.
Uppsala University (Sweden), Department of Government.
University of North Carolina, Department of Political Science.
University of Chicago, Political Psychology Workshop, Departments of Psychology and Political Science.
Pitzer College, Department of Political Science.
- 2003 University of Illinois at Chicago, College of Urban Planning and Public Affairs.
University of Illinois at Chicago, Survey Research Laboratory.
Stanford University, Social Psychology Research Seminar (April).
Stanford University, Social Psychology Research Seminar (October).
Stanford University, Department of Psychology Colloquium Series.
- 2004 Harvard University, Research Workshop in American Politics, Department of Government.
Stanford University, Organizational Behavior Seminar, Graduate School of Business.
Stanford University, Marketing Seminar, Graduate School of Business.
Stanford University, American Empirical Seminar, Stanford Institute for the Quantitative Study of Society.
University of California, Davis, Distinguished Lecture Series, Departments of Psychology and Political Science.
- 2005 The Rand Organization, Santa Monica, California.

- 2006 Harvard University, Department of Psychology.
Duke University, Social Science Research Institute.
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, Department of Political Science.
University of Florida, Department of Psychology.
University of Florida, Department of Political Science.
University of California, Santa Barbara, Department of Psychology.
- 2007 The Rand Organization, Santa Monica, California.
The University of Essex (UK), Department of Government.
The University of Essex (UK), Institute for Social and Economic Research.
- 2008 University of Minnesota, Department of Political Science.
University of California - Berkeley, Department of Political Science – Institute of Governmental Studies.
Northwestern University, School of Communication.
University of California - Berkeley, Institute for Personality and Social Research.
- 2009 Center for Population Research, University of California - Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California.
Institute for Science, Technology, and Public Policy, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas.
Annette Strauss Institute for Civic Participation, Department of Communication Studies, University of Texas – Austin, Austin, Texas.
Department of Political and Social Sciences, Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, Spain.
Department of Psychology, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.
Department of Psychology, University of California, San Diego.
- 2010 Behavioral Science Workshop, Booth School of Business, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.
Social Psychology Colloquium, Department of Psychology, New York University, New York, New York.
- 2011 Colloquium Series, Department of Psychology, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona.
Colloquium Series, School of Politics and Global Studies, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona.
- 2012 Political Psychology Colloquium Series, Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, California.
Department of Geosciences and Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton, University.
Department of Psychology, University of Mannheim, Mannheim, Germany.

On-campus Colloquia

- 1986 Department of Political Science, Ohio State University.
Department of Psychology, Ohio State University.
- 1987 Department of Psychology, Ohio State University.
- 1988 Department of Psychology, Ohio State University.
- 1990 Department of Psychology, Ohio State University.

- 1991 Mershon Center World Affairs Seminar, Mershon Center, Ohio State University.
- 1996 Behavioral Decision Theory Colloquium Series, Department of Psychology, Ohio State University.
CIC Interactive Video Methods Seminar, Department of Political Science, Ohio State University.
- 1997 Interdisciplinary Seminar on Survey Research Methods, Center for Human Resource Research, Ohio State University.
- 1999 Department of Agricultural, Environmental, and Development Economics, Ohio State University.
- 2000 Center for Survey Research, Ohio State University.
- 2002 Social Psychology Colloquium Series, Department of Psychology, Ohio State University.
Department of Agricultural, Environmental, and Development Economics, Ohio State University.
- 2003 Mershon Center Lunch Lecture, The Mershon Center, Ohio State University.
- 2004 Global Climate and Energy Project Fall Seminar Series, Stanford University.
John S. Knight Fellowship Program Seminar, Stanford University.
- 2005 Workshop in Statistical Modeling, Department of Political Science, Stanford University.
Environmental Policy Forum, Center for Environmental Science and Policy, Stanford University.
Humanities and Sciences Forum, Stanford University.
Seminar Series, Summer Research College in Public Policy and Economics, Stanford University.
- 2006 Seminar Series, Summer Research College in Public Policy and Economics, Stanford University.
Woods Energy Series, Woods Institute for the Environment, Stanford University.
- 2007 Ethics @ Noon, Barbara and Bowen McCoy Program in Ethics in Society Lecture Series, Stanford University.
Seminar Series, Summer Research College in Public Policy and Economics, Stanford University.
Opening Plenary, Society of Environmental Journalists Annual Conference, Stanford University.
- 2008 How America Votes: Stanford Professors Answer the Fundamental Questions Raised When U.S Citizens Vote. Workshop sponsored by Stanford in Government.
Transformational Insights: Participation, Collaboration, and Virtual Worlds for Sustainability, Medicine, and Education. Sixth Media X Annual Meeting, Stanford University.
Social Psychology Research Seminar, Stanford University.
Lunch Colloquium Series, Public Policy Program, Stanford University.
Seminar Series, Summer Research College in Public Policy and Economics, Stanford University.
Stanford Parents' Advisory Board Meeting, Stanford University.

- 2009 Environmental Forum, Woods Institute for the Environment, Stanford University.
Woods Institute and School of Earth Sciences Summer Seminar Series, Stanford University.
- 2010 Research Seminar Series, Center for International Security and Cooperation, Stanford University (discussant).
Faculty Speaker Series, Stanford High School Summer College, Stanford University.
Seminar Series, Summer Research College in Public Policy and Economics, Stanford University.
The Prison Lunch Series, Stanford Law and Policy Review, Stanford Law School.
Social Psychology Research Seminar, Stanford University.
- 2011 Address to the Advisory Council of the Woods Institute for the Environment, Stanford University.
Address to the Advisory Council of the Precourt Institute for Energy, Stanford University.
Seminar Series, Summer Research College in Public Policy and Economics, Stanford University.
Summer Short Course on Marine Policy, Center for Ocean Solutions, Stanford University.
Energy @ Stanford & SLAC, Stanford Graduate Summer Institute, Stanford University.
Engaging with Faculty: Stories from Undergraduate Research and Learning Beyond the Classroom, New Student Orientation, Stanford University.
Energy Seminar sponsored by the Woods Institute for the Environment and the Precourt Institute for Energy, Stanford University.
Invited Presentation, Summer Research College Speaker Series, Public Policy Program, Stanford University, Stanford, California.
- 2012 Member of a Faculty Discussion Panel during the Joint Young Environmental Scholars Conference sponsored by the Woods Institute for the Environment and the Environmental Norms Workshop sponsored by the Stanford Humanities Center, Stanford University.
Invited Lecture, "Peering Inside the Mind of the American Voter: The Psychology of Democracy in Action." Back to School Class, 2012 Parents' Weekend, Stanford University. <http://parentsweekend.stanford.edu/overview/biography-mackey>
Invited Presentation, "A Program of Research on Americans' Thinking about Climate Change." Woods Institute for the Environment Community Retreat, Aptos, California.
Invited Presentation, "American Public Opinion on Climate Change." School of Earth Sciences Undergraduate Research Program Seminar Series (cosponsored by SURGE and the Woods Institute for the Environment). Stanford University.
Invited Presentation, Engaging with Faculty: Stories from Undergraduate Research and Learning Beyond the Classroom, New Student Orientation, Stanford University.
Invited Presentation, "Are Elections in America Unfair? Exploring the Impact of Candidate Name Order." Stanford Parents Association, Stanford University.
Panel Member, "Election 2012: Reality Check. A Bloomberg News Post-Presidential-Debate Debate." Sponsored by the Stanford Graduate Program in Journalism and the Stanford Graduate School of Business Politics and Government Club.
Invited Presentation, Summer Research College Speaker Series, Public Policy Program, Stanford University, Stanford, California.
- 2013 Invited Presentation, "The Psychology of American Elections: Getting Into the Heads of Voters", Yost House After-Dinner Presentation.

- Invited Presentation, Engaging with Faculty: Stories from Undergraduate Research and Learning Beyond the Classroom, New Student Orientation, Stanford University.
- Invited Presentation, Summer Research College Speaker Series, Public Policy Program, Stanford University, Stanford, California.
- 2014
- Invited Presentation, “Is it Americans’ Fault that the U.S. Government Has Yet to Seriously Limit Greenhouse Gas Emissions?” School of Earth Sciences Undergraduate Research Program Seminar Series (cosponsored by SURGE and SESUR and the Woods Institute for the Environment). Stanford University.
- Invited Presentation, “Why Elections Go Wrong: The Impact of the Order of Candidates’ Names on the Ballot.” Fred Hillier Lecture Series, English for Foreign Students Program, Stanford University.
- Invited Presentation, Engaging with Faculty: Stories from Undergraduate Research and Learning Beyond the Classroom, New Student Orientation, Stanford University.
- Invited Panel Member, Sustainable World Coalition’s Planet Earth New Play Festival, Stanford University.
- Invited Panel Member, “The Climate Debate Demystified: The Psychology, Media, and Communication Behavior Climate Change.” Sponsored by Students for a Sustainable Stanford, Stanford University.
- Invited Presentation, Summer Research College Speaker Series, Public Policy Program, Stanford University.
- Invited Panelist, “Climate Change: From Science to Action.” Classes without Quizzes, Stanford University.
- 2015
- Invited Presentation, Engaging with Faculty: Stories from Undergraduate Research and Learning Beyond the Classroom, New Student Orientation, Stanford University.
- Invited Presentation, Summer Research College Speaker Series, Political Science Department, Stanford University.
- 2016
- Energy Seminar sponsored by the Woods Institute for the Environment and the Precourt Institute for Energy, Stanford University.
- Invited Presentation, Summer Research College Speaker Series, Political Science Department, Stanford University.
- Invited Presentation, Engaging with Faculty: Stories from Undergraduate Research and Learning Beyond the Classroom, New Student Orientation, Stanford University.
- Invited Presentation, Psychology of the 2016 Election. Stanford in Government Policy Lunch.
- Invited Presentation, “The 2016 Election.” Epidemiology Supper Club, Stanford University Medical School, Stanford, CA.
- 2017
- Invited Presentation, “Public Opinion on Climate Change”, SUPER Faculty Seminar Lunches, Precourt Institute for Energy, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.
- Invited Presentation, Summer Research College Speaker Series, Public Policy Program, Stanford University, Stanford, California.
- Invited Presentation, Summer Research College Methodology Speaker Series, Political Science Department, Stanford University, Stanford, California.
- Invited Presentation, “Why Elections Go Wrong: The Impact of the Order of Candidates’ Names on the Ballot.” Fred Hillier Lecture Series, English for Foreign Students Program, Stanford University.
- Invited Presentation, Engaging with Faculty: Stories from Undergraduate Research and Learning Beyond the Classroom, New Student Orientation, Stanford University.
- Presentation, Communication Department Faculty Retreat, Stanford University.

- 2018 Invited Presentation, “The Accuracy of the 2016 Pre-Election Polls.” Seminar Series of the John S. Knight Journalism Fellowship Program, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.
 Invited Presentation, “The Impact of Candidate Name Order on Election Outcomes.”
 Neurosciences Journal Club and Professional Development Court, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.

Other Presentations

- 2012 Coauthor of presentation by Elisabeth Brügger (Maastricht University). “Establishing the Accuracy of Online Panel Research”, Waikato Management School, University Of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand.
- 2012 Coauthor of presentation by Elisabeth Brügger (Maastricht University). “Establishing the Accuracy of Online Panel Research”, Department of Marketing, Faculty of Business and Economics, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia.
- 2013 Coauthor of presentation by Elisabeth Brügger (Maastricht University). “Establishing the Accuracy of Online Panel Research”, Department of Management and Marketing, Faculty of Business and Economics, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia.
- 2014 Coauthor of presentation by Elisabeth Brügger (Maastricht University). “Establishing the Accuracy of Online Panel Research”, Center for the Study of Choice (CenSoC), University of Technology, Sydney, Australia.
- 2012 Coauthor of presentation by Elisabeth Brügger (Maastricht University). “Establishing the Accuracy of Online Panel Research”, School of Marketing, Australian School of Business, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia

Conferences Coordinated

- 1991 Conference Coordinator, Annual Meeting, Society of Experimental Social Psychology, Columbus, Ohio.
- 1991 Conference Coordinator, “Nags Head Conference on Attitude Strength,” Nags Head, North Carolina.
- 1998 Program Coordinator, Annual Meeting, International Society for Political Psychology, Montreal, Canada.
- 2002-2003 Conference Chair, Annual Meeting, American Association for Public Opinion Research, Nashville, Tennessee.
- 2005 Conference Co-Coordinator, “New Approaches to Understanding Participation in Surveys”, Belmont Conference Center, Elkridge, Maryland.
- 2007 Conference Co-Coordinator, “Cyberinfrastructure and National Election Studies: The Wivenhoe House Conference”. University of Essex, Colchester, UK.
- 2007 Conference Co-Coordinator, “News Media Pollster Input to the American National Election Studies”. Gallup World Headquarters, Washington, DC.

- 2008 Conference Co-Coordinator, “Optimal Coding of Open-Ended Survey Data, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- 2013 Conference Co-Coordinator, “The Future of Survey Research 1”, National Science Foundation, Arlington, Virginia.
- 2013 Conference Co-Coordinator, “The Future of Survey Research 2”, National Science Foundation, Arlington, Virginia.
- 2014 Conference Co-Coordinator, “Robust Research in the Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences”, National Science Foundation, Arlington, Virginia.
- 2015 Conference Co-Coordinator, “Best Practices in Science”, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford University, Stanford, California.
- 2015 Conference Co-Coordinator, “How Voters Think: Lessons from Science and Practice.” A meeting of political scientists with Democratic Party campaign consultants. Harris School of Public Policy, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.
- 2015 Conference Co-Coordinator, “How Voters Think: Lessons from Science and Practice.” A meeting of political scientists with Republican Party campaign consultants. Harris School of Public Policy, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.
- 2017 Conference Coordinator, “Workshop on Implicit Bias.” National Science Foundation, Alexandria, Virginia.

Professional Service

- 1989-1990 Chair, Student Paper Competition Committee, American Association for Public Opinion Research.
- 1990 Member, Planning Committee for the 1990 National Election Study.
- 1990 Member, Conference Committee for the 1991 Annual Meeting, American Association for Public Opinion Research.
- 1991 Participant in an Expert Questionnaire Evaluation Panel as a part of a Project Comparing Pre-Testing Methods, National Center for Health Statistics.
- 1994 Member, Student Paper Competition Committee, American Association for Public Opinion Research.
- 1995 Member, National Science Foundation Special Grant Proposal Evaluation Panel on Valuation for Environmental Policy.
- 1996 Member, Student Paper Competition Committee, American Association for Public Opinion Research.
- 1996 Member, Planning Committee for the 1996 National Election Study.
- 1997-2001
2003, 2004 Member, Conference Committee, American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting.

1998	Member, Planning Committee for the 1998 National Election Pilot Study.
1999	Senior Research Advisor, The Gallup Organization.
1997-2006	Member, Board of Overseers, National Election Studies, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
2000-2003	Member, Governing Council, International Society of Political Psychology.
2000-2003	Member, Conference Committee, International Society of Political Psychology.
2000-2002	Member, Survey Methodology Group of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth.
2000-2008	Member, Board of Overseers, General Social Survey, National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago.
2001	Member, Advisory Board of the Canadian Election Study, McGill University, University of Montreal, and University of Toronto.
2001-2002	Associate Conference Chair, American Association for Public Opinion Research.
2001-2002	Chair, Committee to Award the Erik H. Erikson Early Career Award for Excellence and Creativity in the Field of Political Psychology, International Society of Political Psychology.
2001	Member, Visiting Committee to Evaluate a Proposed Ph.D. Program in Survey Research and Methodology, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska.
2002	Member, Advisory Panel, Special Competition to Fund Research on Survey and Statistical Methodology; Methodology, Measurement, and Statistics Program, National Science Foundation.
2003	Member, Advisory Board of the Canadian Election Study, McGill University, University of Montreal, and University of Toronto.
2004-2006	Member, Advisory Committee for the Division of Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences, National Science Foundation.
2004-2006	Member, Scientific Advisory Board, Polimetrix, Palo Alto, California.
2004	Member, Workshop on Cyberinfrastructure and the Social Sciences, National Science Foundation.
2005	Organizing committee, Conference entitled "New Approaches to Understanding Participation in Surveys," Belmont Conference Center, Elkridge, Maryland, sponsored by the National Science Foundation.
2005	Member, Philip E. Converse Book Award Committee, American Political Science Association.
2005	Member, Nominating committee, International Society for Political Psychology.

2005	Member, Working Group on Public Attitudes and Ethical Issues, Global Roundtable on Climate Change, Earth Institute, Columbia University.
2006	Dissertation committee member, William M. van der Veld, Faculty of Social and Behavioral Sciences, University of Amsterdam.
2007	Participant, “Public Understanding of Mathematics/Mathematicians Understanding the Public” Conference, Mathematical Sciences Education Board, The National Academies, Washington, D.C.
2007	Associated Scientist, Statistics and Methodology Department, National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.
2007	Participant, “Workshop on Planning for the Future of the General Social Survey,” National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.
2007-	Member, Advisory Board, Book Series on Political Psychology, Oxford University Press.
2007-	Member, International Advisory Board, Measurement and Experiments in the Social Sciences, Institute for Data Collection and Research, University of Tilburg, The Netherlands.
2008	Participant, “Meeting to Assess Public Attitudes about Climate Change,” sponsored by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NASA, and the Center for Excellence in Climate Change Communication Research, Silver Spring, Maryland.
2008	Participant, The Harvard Globalization Survey Workshop, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
2008-2012	Member, Board of Directors, Climate Central, Princeton, New Jersey, and Palo Alto, California.
2008	Panel Participant, Career Day, Menlo School, Menlo Park, California.
2009-2010	Member, AAPOR Opt-in Panel Online Panel Task Force.
2012	Chair, Committee to Conduct a Site Visit Review of the General Social Survey for the National Science Foundation.
2011-2016	Member, Advisory Committee for the Division of Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences, National Science Foundation.
2012	Member, Policy Impact Award Committee, American Association for Public Opinion Research.
2012	Member, Advisory Committee on Study to Evaluate the Impact of Survey Response Rates, Pew Researcher Center, Washington, DC.
2012-	Member, Advisory Board, Voice of the People.
2012	Chair, Subcommittee on the Future of Survey Research, Advisory Committee for the Division of Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences, National Science Foundation.
2013-2016	Member, Governing Council, International Society of Political Psychology.

2012-2015	Member, Subcommittee on Replication in Social, Behavioral, and Economic Science Research, Advisory Committee for the Division of Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences, National Science Foundation.
2014-	Member, International Advisory Board, Norwegian Citizen Panel, Digital Social Science Core Faculty, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway.
2015-2016	Member, Standing Committee on the Future of NSF-Supported Social Science Surveys, Committee on National Statistics, Division of Behavioral and Social Science and Education, The National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine.
2016	Chair, Committee to Award the Noel Markwell Media Award, International Society of Political Psychology.
2016-2017	Member, Committee to Award the AAPOR Mitofsky Innovators Award, American Association for Public Opinion Research.
2016-2017	Member, Subcommittee on Workplace Climate and Harassment, Working Group on Diversity, National Institutes of Health.
2017	Member, Committee on AAPOR Standard and Litigation Surveys. American Association for Public Opinion Research.
2018	Co-convener, CPS Forum on Measuring Voter Turnout, Summer at Census, U.S. Census Bureau, Suitland, Maryland.

Department and University Service

1985-1996 2001-2003	Faculty Advisor, Social Psychology Colloquium Series, Ohio State University.
1985-1990	Chair, Social Psychology Area Admissions Committee, Ohio State University.
1985-1990	Member, Psychology Department Admissions Committee, Ohio State University.
1986-1987	Member, Psychology Department Stipends Committee, Ohio State University.
1986-1988	Member, Lazenby Equipment Committee, Ohio State University.
1986-1987	Member, Social Psychology Area Search Committee for Two Permanent Senior Faculty Members, Ohio State University.
1988-1989	Member, Social Psychology Area Search Committee for Junior Faculty Member, Ohio State University.
1990-1991	Member, Search Committee for Junior Faculty Member in Industrial/Organizational Psychology, Ohio State University.
1989-1994	Co-Coordinator, Political Psychology Minor Program Steering Committee, Political Science Department, Ohio State University.

1989-1996, 1999-2003	Member, Psychology Department Speakers Committee, Ohio State University.
1990-1996	Member, Psychology Department Subject Pool Supervisory Committee, Ohio State University.
1995-1996	Chair, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences Survey Research Advisory Committee, Ohio State University.
1995-1996	Member, Political Science Department Search Committee, Ohio State University.
1997-2003	Member, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences Center for Survey Research Advisory Committee, Ohio State University.
2000	Chair, Social Psychology Senior Faculty Search Committee, Ohio State University.
2000	Member, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences Oversight Committee for the Center for Human Resource Research, Ohio State University.
2001-2003	Member, Psychology Department Promotion and Tenure Committee, Ohio State University.
2001-2002	Chair, Social Psychology Junior Faculty Search Committee, Ohio State University.
2002	Faculty advisor, Summer Research Opportunity Program, Committee on Instructional Cooperation (CIC), Ohio State University.
2003-2004	Member, Planning Committee for the Social Science Research Institute, Stanford University.
2003-2004	Member, Steering Committee for the Methods of Analysis Program in the Social Sciences, Stanford University.
2004-	Faculty Affiliate, Center for Comparative Studies in Race and Ethnicity, Stanford University.
2004	Grant proposal review committee, Environmental Interdisciplinary Initiatives Program, Stanford Institute for the Environment, Stanford University.
2004-2005	Planning Committee for the Stanford Center on Longevity, Stanford University.
2005-2008	Member, Faculty Leadership Committee, Stanford Institute for the Environment, Stanford University.
2006	Grant proposal review committee, Environmental Venture Grants Program, Woods Institute for the Environment, Stanford University.
2007	Co-chair, Grant proposal review committee, Environmental Venture Grants Program, Woods Institute for the Environment, Stanford University.
2012-	Member, Grant proposal review committee, Environmental Venture Grants Program, Woods Institute for the Environment, Stanford University.
2012-2016	Member, Course Evaluation Committee, Stanford University.
2012-2013	Member, Provost's Advisory Committee on Postdoctoral Affairs, Stanford University.

- | | |
|------|--|
| 2012 | Member, Evaluation committee for applicants to the Emmett Interdisciplinary Program in Environment & Resources, Stanford University. |
| 2013 | Member, Evaluation committee for applicants to the Emmett Interdisciplinary Program in Environment & Resources, Stanford University. |
| 2014 | Member, Evaluation committee for applicants to the Emmett Interdisciplinary Program in Environment & Resources, Stanford University. |

Ad Hoc Reviewer

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology
 Journal of Experimental Social Psychology
 Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin
 Social Psychology Quarterly
 European Journal of Social Psychology
 Social Cognition
 Basic and Applied Social Psychology
 Journal of Personality
 Psychological Review
 Psychological Bulletin
 Psychological Science
 Psychological Assessment
 Personality and Social Psychology Review
 Psychology and Aging
 Risk Analysis
 Psychology, Public Policy, and Law
 American Political Science Review
 American Journal of Political Science
 American Politics Quarterly
 Western Political Quarterly
 Political Research Quarterly
 Political Behavior
 Research and Politics
 Journal of Politics
 Political Analysis
 Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics
 Southeastern Political Review
 Public Opinion Quarterly
 International Journal of Public Opinion Research
 Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology
 Political Psychology
 Political Communication
 International Studies Quarterly
 American Sociological Review
 Sociological Methods and Research
 Sociological Methodology
 Social Science Quarterly
 Social Problems
 Journal of Official Statistics
 Journal of the American Statistical Association
 Journal of Economic Psychology
 Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization

Communication Research
 Journal of Consumer Research
 Journal of Science Communication
 Journal of Research in Personality
 Developmental Psychology
 Motivation and Emotion
 Psychophysiology
 Climatic Change
 Climate Change Letters
 Review of Policy Research
 Annals of Epidemiology
 Communication Methods and Measures
 Preventive Medicine
 New Jersey Medicine
 Journal of Medical Internet Research
 Academic Press
 Praeger Publishers
 Alfred A. Knopf Publishers
 Brooks/Cole Publishing Company
 Harper and Row Publishers
 MacMillan Publishing Company
 Cambridge University Press
 Oxford University Press
 W. W. Norton
 W. H. Freeman
 National Academy of Sciences
 National Science Foundation - Social Psychology Program
 National Science Foundation - Sociology Program
 National Science Foundation - Political Science Program
 National Science Foundation - Program in Methodology, Measurement, and Statistics in the Social Sciences
 Society for Consumer Psychology
 American Psychological Association
 Time-sharing Experiments for the Social Sciences (TESS)
 University of Michigan, Department of Political Science (P&T)
 University of Minnesota, Department of Political Science (P&T)
 University of Minnesota, Department of Psychology (P&T)
 University of Southern California, Department of Psychology (P&T)
 University of Texas – Austin, Department of Communication Studies (P&T)
 London School of Economics and Political Science, Methodology Institute (P&T)
 University of Nebraska, Department of Political Science (P&T)
 University of Nebraska, Department of Psychology (P&T)
 Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Department of Political Science (P&T)
 University of Chicago, Harris School of Public Policy (P&T)
 University of Chicago, Department of Political Science (P&T)
 Iowa State University, Department of Psychology (P&T)
 Ohio State University, University Libraries (P&T)
 University of Florida, Department of Psychology (P&T)
 University of Pennsylvania, Department of Political Science (P&T)
 Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan (P&T)
 Columbia University, Department of Political Science (P&T)
 American University, School of Public Affairs (P&T)
 Center for Advanced Study in the Social and Behavioral Sciences
 University of Mannheim, School of Social Sciences, Department of Political Science (P&T)
 Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities and Social Sciences

Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research, Division of Social Sciences
Workers' Compensation Board of British Columbia
Fund for Scientific Research – Flanders, Brussels, Belgium

Consulting and Court Testimony

Office of Science and Technology Policy, The White House, Washington D.C.
Socio-Environmental Studies Laboratory, National Institutes of Health, Washington, D.C.
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Washington, D.C.
Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.
National Aeronautics and Space Administration (Robert Dodd and Associates/The Battelle Memorial Institute),
Mountain View, California.
Center for Survey Methods Research, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.
Office of Survey Methods Research, U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, D.C.
Leadership Analysis Group, U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, McLean, Virginia.
United States Government Accountability Office, Washington, DC.
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, Georgia.
National Cancer Institute, Rockville, Maryland.
Centre for Comparative Social Surveys, City University, London, United Kingdom.
Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, California.
SRI International, Arlington, Virginia.
YouGov, London, United Kingdom.
Momentum Market Intelligence, Portland, Oregon.
Central Market Research and Insights, Microsoft, Redmond, Washington.
The Urban Institute, Washington, D.C.
Industrial Economics, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
Healthcare Research Systems, Columbus, Ohio.
Survey Research Center, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland.
Center for Human Resource Research, Columbus, Ohio.
Washington State University, Pullman, Washington.
Stanford University Alumni Association, Stanford, California.
Turner Research, Jacksonville, Florida.
NuStats, Austin, Texas.
Kaiser Family Foundation, Menlo Park, California.
University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
Achievement Associates, Darnestown, Maryland.
The Saguaro Seminar: Civic Engagement in America, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
Office of Social Research, CBS Inc., New York, New York.
ABC News, New York, New York.
Home Box Office, New York, New York.
Google, Mountain View, California.
Pfizer, Inc., New York, New York.
Amgen, Thousand Oaks, California.
Beau Townsend Ford Dealership, Dayton, Ohio.
United States Trotting Association, Columbus, Ohio.
Berlex Laboratories, Inc., Wayne, New Jersey.
MJ Research, Waltham, Massachusetts.
Empire Blue Cross/Blue Shield, New York, New York.
Nike, Inc., Portland, Oregon.
U.S. Senator Brian Schatz (Hawaii)
The Attorney General of Oklahoma.
Office of Lake County Prosecuting Attorney, Painesville, Ohio.
The Attorney General of the State of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio.

Donald McTigue, Esq., Columbus, Ohio.
 Thompson Coburn LLP, St. Louis, Missouri.
 Shook, Hardy, & Bacon LLP, Kansas City, Missouri.
 Arnold and Porter LLP, New York, New York.
 Bradley W. Hertz, Esq., Los Angeles, California.
 Larson King LLP, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
 Paul, Hastings, Janofsky, and Walker, LLP, San Francisco, California.
 Carr, Korein, Tillery, LLP, Chicago, Illinois.
 Milberg, Weiss, Bershad, Hynes, and Lerach, LLP, New York, New York.
 ourgault & Harding, Las Vegas, Nevada.
 Aikin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld, LLP, Washington, DC.
 McManemin and Smith, PC, Dallas, Texas.
 Zimmerman Reed, PLLP, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
 Spolin Silverman, Cohen, and Bertlett LLP, Santa Monica, California.
 Righetti Wynne P.C., San Francisco, California.
 Blackwell Sanders Peper Martin LLP, Kansas City, Missouri.
 Davis Wright Tremaine LLP, Seattle, Washington.
 Storch Amini & Munves, P.C., New York, New York.
 Marc O. Stern, APC, La Jolla, California.
 Morris, Sullivan, & Lemkul, LLP, San Diego, California.
 Twomey Law Office, Epsom, New Hampshire.
 KamberLaw LLC, New York, New York.
 Righetti Law Firm, P.C., San Francisco, California.
 Dostart Clapp Gordon & Coveney LLP, San Diego, California.
 Wynne Law Firm, Greenbrae, California.
 Lorens and Associates, San Diego, California.
 Arias, Ozzello & Gignac, LLP, Los Angeles, California.
 Righetti Glugoski, P.C., San Francisco, California.
 Kaplan Fox, & Kilsheimer LLP, San Francisco, California.
 Perkins Coie, LLP, Washington, DC.
 Levi & Korsinsky LLP, Stamford, Connecticut.
 King, Blackwell, Zehnder, & Wermuth, P. A., Orlando, Flor
 Keller Grover, LLP, San Francisco, California.
 Law Offices of Kevin T. Barnes, Los Angeles, California.
 Cohelan & Khoury, San Diego, California.
 Rastegar & Matern, Torrance, California.
 Law Offices of Joseph Antonelli, West Covina, California.
 Minter Ellison Lawyers, Sydney, Australia.
 Silverman Thompson Slutkin White LLC, Baltimore, Maryland.
 Namanny Byrne, & Owens, P.C. Lake Forest, California
 Robbins, Geller, Rudman, & Dowd, LLP, Boca Raton, Florida.
 Callahan and Blaine, Santa Ana, California.
 Richardson, Patrick, Westbrook, and Brickman, Mount Pleasant, South Carolina.
 Hurst and Hurst, San Diego, California.
 Leonard Carder, San Francisco, California.
 Initiative Legal Group, Los Angeles, California.
 Khorramu Pollard & Abir, Los Angeles, California.
 Rukin, Hyland, Doria, and Tindall, San Francisco, California.
 Carlson, Calladine, & Peterson, San Francisco, California.
 Munger, Tolles, & Olson, Los Angeles, California.
 American Civil Liberties Union of Northern California/Brad Seligman/Howard, Rice, Nemerovski, Canady,
 Falk, & Rabkin, San Francisco/Berkeley, California.
 Foley & Lardner LLP, San Francisco, California.
 Law Offices of Sima Fard, Irvine, California.

Rifkin, Livingston, Levitan, & Silver, Annapolis, Maryland.
 Altshuler Berzon LLP, San Francisco, California.
 Law Offices of Hathaway, Perrett, Webster, Powers, Chrisman, & Gutierrez, Ventura, California.
 R. Rex Parris Law Firm, Lancaster, California.
 McCune Wright, LLP, Redlands, California.
 Gustafson Gluek PLLC, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
 Saltz, Mongeluzzi, Barrett, & Bendesky, P.C. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
 Reinhardt, Wendorf, & Blanchfield, St. Paul, Minnesota.
 Wexler Wallace LLP, Chicago, Illinois.
 Cotchett, Pitre, & McCarthy, Burlingame, California.
 Berman De Valerio, San Francisco, California.
 Marlin & Saltzman, Agoura Hills, California
 Lawyers for Justics, Glendale, California.
 Klafter, Olsen, & Lesser LLP, Rye Brook, New York.
 Shavitz Law Group, P.A., Boca Raton, Florida.
 Capstone Law APC, Los Angeles, California.
 Law Offices of Ronald A. Marron, San Diego, California.
 Del Mar Law Group, San Diego, California.
 Stonebarger Law, Folsom, California.
 Cahill Gordon & Reindel, New York, New York.
 Hogue & Belong, San Diego, California.
 Morris Sullivan Lemkul, San Diego, California.
 Traber & Voorhees, Pasadena, California.
 Workman Law Firm, San Francisco, California.
 Kingsley & Kingsley, Encino, California.
 Sheno Koes, Pasadena, California.
 KamberLaw, Denver, Colorado.

Short Courses on Questionnaire Design

Internal Revenue Service, Washington, DC.
 United States General Accounting Office, Washington, DC.
 Office of Management and Budget, The White House, Washington, DC.
 United States Government Accountability Office, Washington, DC.
 United States Federal Trade Commission, Washington, DC.
 United State Census Bureau, Suitland, Maryland.
 Science Resources Statistics Program, National Science Foundation, Washington, DC.
 National Opinion Research Center, Chicago, Illinois.
 Survey Research Laboratory, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.
 Center for AIDS Prevention Studies, Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University of California,
 San Francisco, California.
 Monitor Company, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
 American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, St. Louis, Missouri.
 American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Portland, Oregon
 American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Miami, Florida
 New York Chapter of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, New York, New York.
 Office for National Statistics, London, United Kingdom.
 Market Strategies, Southfield, Michigan.
 Total Research Corporation, Princeton, New Jersey.
 Pfizer, Inc., New York, New York.
 Worldwide Market Intelligence Conference, IBM, Rye, New York.
 American Society of Trial Consultants Annual Meeting, Williamsburg, Virginia.

American Society of Trial Consultants Annual Meeting, Westminster, Colorado.
 American Society of Trial Consultants Annual Meeting, Memphis, Tennessee.
 American Marketing Association Advanced Research Techniques Forum, Vail, Colorado.
 Satisfaction Research Division, IBM, White Plains, New York.
 American Marketing Association Marketing Effectiveness Online Seminar Series.
 Faculty of Education, University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg, South Africa.
 Odom Institute, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina (2005 and 2009)
 Google, Mountain View, California.
 Eric M. Mindich Encounters with Authors, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
 RTI International, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina.
 BC Stats, Province of British Columbia Ministry of Labour and Citizens' Services, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada.
 Alphadetail, San Mateo, California.
 Amgen, Thousand Oaks, California.
 Center for Political Studies, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
 San Jose State University, San Jose, California.
 Summer School 2008, Australian Market and Social Research Society, Coffs Harbour, New South Wales, Australia.
 Professional Development Program, Australian Market and Social Research Society, Sydney, Australia (2008 and 2009).
 Professional Development Program, Australian Market and Social Research Society, Melbourne, Australia.
 Professional Development Program Webinar, Australian Market and Social Research Society (2012).
 Zentrum für Umfragen, Methoden und Analysen (ZUMA), Mannheim, Germany.
 Department of Marketing, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, Illinois.
 Comparative Survey Research and Methodology Workshop, sponsored by TNS Opinion and the Centre for the Study of Political Change at the University of Siena, Brussels, Belgium (2010 and 2011).
 Department of Survey Design and Methodology, GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences, Mannheim, Germany.
 Methodology Institute, London School of Economics and Political Science, London, United Kingdom.
 Summer School 2013, Australian Market and Social Research Society, Gold Coast, Australia.
 Social Science Research Laboratories, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatchewan, Canada (2015).

University Teaching

Summer Institute in Political Psychology (Instructor and Co-Director), Political Science and Psychology 892A, 892B, Ohio State University.
 Research Methods in Social Psychology, Psychology 872, Ohio State University.
 Systematic Theory in Social Psychology, Psychology 873C, Ohio State University.
 Psychological Perspectives on Political Behavior, Psychology 873D, Ohio State University.
 The Psychology of Mass Politics, Political Science 894, Ohio State University.
 Questionnaire Design for Attitude Measurement, Psychology 788, Ohio State University.
 Supervisor of graduate student TAs teaching Introduction to Social Psychology, Psychology 320, Ohio State University.
 Introduction to Social Psychology, Psychology H320 & H367.01, Ohio State University.

The Psychology of Public Attitudes, Psychology 630, Ohio State University.

Survey Design, Clinical Research Curriculum Program, College of Medicine, College of Optometry, and School of Public Health, Ohio State University.

Questionnaire Design for Attitude Measurement, Psychology 711, Summer Institute in Survey Research Techniques, University of Michigan.

Cognitive Psychology and Survey Methods, Psychology 988, Summer Institute in Survey Research Techniques, University of Michigan.

Response Scales for Satisfaction Measurement, Joint Program in Survey Methodology, University of Maryland-University of Michigan.

Designing Effective Questionnaires, Methodology Institute, London School of Economics and Political Science, London, United Kingdom.

Techniques for Assessing Questionnaire Quality, Department of Methodology and Statistics, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

Assessment of Questionnaire Quality, Interuniversity Graduate School of Psychometrics and Sociometrics, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

Advanced Issues in Questionnaire Design, Psychology 688, Summer Institute in Survey Research Techniques, University of Michigan.

The Study of Political Change at the Individual Level: The Panel Study, 2001 TMR Winter School in Comparative Electoral Research, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

Aviation Marketing (guest lecture), Aviation and Aeronautical Engineering 654, Ohio State University.

Advanced Questionnaire Design: Maximizing Reliability and Validity, Essex Summer School in Social Science Data Analysis and Collection, Department of Government, University of Essex, UK.

Introduction to Communication Theory (guest lecturer), Communication 311, Stanford University.

Media Technologies, People, and Society (guest lecturer), Communication 1, Stanford University.

Graduate Research Methods (guest lecturer), Psychology 290, Stanford University.

Questionnaire Design for Surveys and Laboratory Experiments: Social and Cognitive Perspectives, Communication 239, Stanford University.

Survey Research Methods: Describing Large Populations with Small Samples and Precise Measures, Communication 135, Stanford University.

Advanced Research Design, Communication 318, Stanford University.

Subjective Measurement in Surveys, Joint Program in Survey Methodology, University of Maryland-University of Michigan.

Summer Institute in Political Psychology (instructor, co-director, and director), Stanford University.

Communication Research Methods, Communication 106/206, Stanford University.

New Models and Methods in the Social Sciences (lecturer), Sociology 384, Stanford University, 2000, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2017.

Coping with Climate Change: Life after Copenhagen (guest lecturer), Continuing Studies Sci 31, Stanford University.

What the American Public Believes about Climate Change (guest lecture), Introduction to Earth Systems, Earth Systems 10, Stanford University.

Language and Attitudes (guest lecture), Topics in Sociolinguistics, Linguistics 259, Stanford University.
The Psychology of Communication about Politics in America, Communication 164, 264; Political Science 224L, 324, Psychology 170, Stanford University.

Introduction to Communication (guest lecture), Communication 1A, Stanford University.

Research Methods Lecture Series (guest lecture on Questionnaire Design), Summer Research College Program, Political Science Department, Stanford University.

Selected News Media Coverage of Research, Interviews, and Quotes

The New York Times	The Chronicle Telegram (Elyria, OH)
The Washington Post	Chronicle of Higher Education
The Wall Street Journal	The Cleveland Plain Dealer
The Christian Science Monitor	The Clovis News Journal (Clovis, NM)
USA Today	The Columbus Dispatch
US News and World Report	The Contra Costa Times (Walnut Creek, CA)
The Economist	The Courier Times (Levittown, PA)
New Scientist Magazine	The Daily Review (Hayward, CA)
Science	The Dallas Morning News
Scientific American	The Dayton Daily News
Nature	The Denver Post
Popular Science	The Desert Sun
Glamour	The Detroit Free Press
Time	The Durango Herald
Newsweek	The Fort Wayne Journal Gazette
Business Week	The Fort Worth Star-Telegram
The Akron Beacon Journal	The Grand Rapids Press
The Alameda Times-Star	The Herald Sun (Durham, NC)
The Appeal-Democrat (Marysville, CA)	The Houston Chronicle
The Athens Banner-Herald	Idaho Press
The Anchorage Daily News	The Indianapolis Star
The Austin American-Statesman	The Kansas City Star
The Bellingham Herald (Bellingham, WA)	The Kentucky Post
The Boston Globe	The Ledger (Lakeland, Florida)
The Bryan-College Station Eagle	The Lansing State Journal
The Bucks County Courier Times	The Lexington Herald Leader
The Buffalo News	The Lincoln Journal Star (Lincoln, NE)
The Centre Daily Times (State College, PA)	The Los Angeles Sentinel
The Charlotte Observer	The Los Angeles Times
The Chattanooga Times Free Press	The Louisville Courier-Journal
The Chicago Tribune	The Manitowoc Herald Times Reporter
The Chicago Sun-Times	

The Metropolitan News-Enterprise (Los Angeles, CA)
 The Miami Herald
 The Minneapolis Star Tribune
 The Mobile Register
 The Monterey County Herald
 The Morning Call (Allentown, PA)
 The Nashua Telegraph
 The New Haven Register
 Niagara Gazette, Niagara Falls, New York
 The Oakland Post
 The Oakland Tribune
 The Ohio County Monitor
 The Orlando Sentinel
 The Philadelphia Inquirer
 The Portland Press Herald
 The Reading Eagle (Reading, PA)
 The Rocky Mountain News
 The Sacramento Bee
 The St. Petersburg Times, St. Petersburg, Florida
 The San Francisco Chronicle
 The San Francisco Examiner
 The Sarasota Herald Tribune
 Savannah Morning News
 The Seattle Times
 The Seattle Post Intelligencer
 The Southern Ledger
 The Spokane Spokesman-Review
 The Springfield News Leader
 The Springville Journal
 The Staten Island Advance
 The Statesman Journal (Salem, Oregon)
 The Scranton Times-Tribune (Scranton, Pennsylvania)
 The Star Democrat (Easton, MD)
 The Syracuse Post-Standard
 The Tampa Tribune
 The Titusville Herald
 The Union-News and Sunday Republican
 The Washington Examiner
 The Washington Times
 The Wenatchee World
 The Wichita Eagle
 The Wisconsin State Journal
 The Worcester Telegram (Massachusetts)
 The York Daily Record
 The York Dispatch (York, PA)
 Ottawa Citizen
 The Jerusalem Post
 Black Star News
 The Economist
 The Financial Times (London)
 The Guardian
 The International Herald Tribune

The Birmingham Post
 The International Herald Tribune
 The Scotsman
 The Sunday Mail
 The Express
 The Stanford Daily
 The Ohio State University Lantern
 The Telegraph-Journal, Saint John, New Brunswick, Canada
 Campaigns and Elections
 Newhouse News Service
 The Associated Press
 United Press International
 Gannett News Service
 Bloomberg
 The Atlantic
 Forbes
 Fortune
 The Nation
 This Magazine
 The Daily Beast
 Grist
 Politifact
 Law 360
 Psychology Today
 California
 Air Safety Weekly
 Mother Jones
 National Journal
 New York Magazine
 Columbia Journalism Review
 American Psychological Association Monitor
 The Voice of America
 ABC World News Sunday
 ABC World News This Morning
 ABC World News Now
 BBC News
 BBC World Service
 MSNBC
 CBC Television News
 CNN, Lou Dobbs Tonight
 Fox News
 WCMH TV, Columbus, Ohio
 WBNS TV, Columbus, Ohio
 Ohio News Network TV, Columbus, Ohio
 WSYX TV, Columbus, Ohio
 WOSU AM, Columbus, Ohio
 WOSU FM, Columbus, Ohio
 KGO-TV, San Francisco, California
 KGO AM, San Francisco, California
 KPCC, Pasadena, California
 KTVU, Oakland, California
 Bloomberg Radio
 Pentagon Channel, Sirius Radio

Air America
 Rush Limbaugh
 Jerry Doyle
 Morning in American (syndicated radio program)
 CSPAN-1
 Washington Week with Gwen Ifill
 New Hampshire Public Radio.
 Weekend Edition Saturday, National Public Radio
 (1992, 2006;
<http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=6471912>)
 Science Friday, National Public Radio (2012,
<http://sciencefriday.com/segment/10/26/2012/in-twitter-we-trust-can-social-media-sway-voters.html>)
 Living on Earth, National Public Radio
 (<http://www.loe.org/shows/shows.htm?programID=06-P13-00015#feature5>)
 The Savage Nation (nationally syndicated radio program)
 Andrew Wilkow, Sirius Patriot 144, Sirius Radio
 The Climate Code, The Weather Channel.
 OnPoint, E&E TV
 (http://www.eandevideo_guide/612?search_term=s=krosnick&page=1&sort_type=date)
 Conde Naste Portfolio
 The Hill
 Discovery News
 International Business Times
 ABCNews.com
 CBSNews.com
 Slate.com
 Aero-news.net
 Naturalnews.com
 Huffingtonpost.com
 Realclearpolitics.com
 PhysOrg.com
 Climateprogress.org

Climatesciencewatch.org
 DailyKos.com
 Sciencecentric.com
 Miller-McCune.com
 Scienceblogs.com
 Energysavingsweekly.com
 Scientificblogging.com
 Careerscientist.com
 Scienceblogs.com
 Sierraclub.com
 Hillheat.com
 Projectgroundswell.com
 Climatewatch (KQED.org)
 Pollster.com
 Kuratkull.com
 Nature.com
 National Review Online
 CNYcentral.com
 WTOP.com
 WBUR
 Treehugger
 Inside EPA
 Grist
 Channel4000.com
 AARP.org
 Pentagraph.com
 Environmentalhealthnews.com
 Wattsupwiththat.com
 Daily.sightline.org
 Alternet.org
 Greenreport.it
 Word.Emerson.edu
 DailyFreePress.com
 Thnkprogress.org
 Podcast: Stanford School of Medicine 1:2:1:
<http://med.stanford.edu/121/2010/krosnick.html>
 “Gibson on Fox”, Fox News Radio
 “To the Point”, KCRW Radio

Theses and Dissertations Supervised

Boninger, D. S. (1988). The determinants of attitude importance. Master's Thesis. Ohio State University.

Chuang, Y. C. (1988). The structure of attitude strength. Master's Thesis. Ohio State University.

Roman, R. J. (1988). A cognitive dissonance interpretation of the timing of punishment. Honors Thesis. Ohio State University.

Chuang, Y. C. (1989). Policy voting and persuasion in American presidential elections: The role of attitude importance. Ph.D. Dissertation. Ohio State University.

Kost, K. A. (1989). Complexity as a situationally modifiable property of cognitive structure. Master's

- Thesis. Ohio State University.
- Li, F. (1989). Order of information acquisition and the effect of base-rates on social judgments. Master's Thesis. Ohio State University.
- Berent, M. K. (1990). Attitude importance and the recall of attitude-relevant information. Master's Thesis. Ohio State University.
- Betz, A. L. (1990). Backward conditioning of attitudes using subliminal photographic stimuli. Master's Thesis. Ohio State University.
- Fabrigar, L. R. (1991). The effect of question order and attitude importance on the false consensus effect. Master's Thesis. Ohio State University.
- Reed, D. R. (1991). Associative memory structure and the evaluation of political leaders. Ph.D. Dissertation. Ohio State University.
- Berent, M. K. (1994). Attitude importance and information processing. Ph.D. Dissertation. Ohio State University.
- Narayan, S. S. (1994). Response effects in attitude surveys: An examination of the satisficing explanation. Master's Thesis. Ohio State University.
- Miller, J. M. (1994). Mediators and moderators of agenda-setting and priming. Master's Thesis. Ohio State University.
- Smith, W. A. (1995). Mental coin-flipping and non-differentiation in surveys: Tests of satisficing hypotheses. Honors Thesis. Ohio State University.
- Visser, P. S. (1995). The relation between age and susceptibility to attitude change: A new approach to an old question. Master's Thesis. Ohio State University.
- Narayan, S. S. (1995). Satisficing in attitude surveys: The impact of cognitive skills, motivation, and task difficulty on response effects. Ph.D. Dissertation. Ohio State University.
- Ankerbrand, A. L. (1997). Attitude formation and the bivariate model: A study of the relationship between beliefs and attitudes. Master's Thesis. Ohio State University.
- Bizer, G. Y. (1997). The relation between attitude importance and attitude accessibility. Master's Thesis. Ohio State University.
- Visser, P. S. (1998). Testing the common-factors model of attitude strength. Ph.D. Dissertation. Ohio State University.
- Miller, J. M. (2000). Threats and opportunities as motivators of political activism. Ph.D. Dissertation. Ohio State University.
- Chang, L. (2001). A comparison of Samples and response quality obtained from RDD telephone survey methodology and Internet survey methodology. Ph.D. Dissertation. Ohio State University.
- Holbrook, A. L. (2002). Operative and meta-psychological strength-related attitude features: A study of

- knowledge volume, ambivalence, and accessibility. Ph.D. Dissertation. Ohio State University.
- Lampron, S. F. (2002). Self-interest, values, involvement, and susceptibility to attitude change. Master's Thesis. Ohio State University.
- Shaeffer, E. M. (2003). Response effects in questionnaires: A comparison of minimally balanced and fully balanced forced choice questions and rating and ranking procedures. Master's Thesis. Ohio State University.
- Pfent, A. (2004). Rationalization of candidate preferences: New evidence of determinants of attitude change. Master's Thesis. Ohio State University.
- Lein, J. (2006). Issue saliency in proximity and directional voting models: A 1996 case study. Honors thesis. Stanford University.
- Miller, L. E. (2007). Voting in ballot initiative elections. Ph.D. Dissertation. Stanford University.
- Bannon, B. (2008). Tell it like it is: News media priming – Extensions and applications. Ph.D. Dissertation. Stanford University.
- Blocksom, D. (2008). The ballot order effect: The 2004 Presidential election in Ohio. Honors Thesis. Stanford University.
- Chen, E. (2008). Me first! Assessing the significance of ballot order effects on elections in North Dakota. Honors Thesis. Stanford University.
- Chiang, I. A. (2008). The principle of congruence in asking questions. Ph.D. Dissertation. Stanford University.
- Garland, P. (2008). Still hoping for separate and unequal: New perspective son racial attitudes and media in America. Ph.D. Dissertation. Stanford University.
- Harder, J. (2008). Why do people vote? The relationship between political efficacy and voter turnout. Honors Thesis. Stanford University.
- Malhotra, N. (2008). Essays on survey methodology and bandwagon effects. Ph.D. Dissertation. Stanford University.
- Schneider, D. (2008). Measurement in surveys and elections: Interviewer effects in election surveys, name order on election ballots, and customer satisfaction surveys. Ph.D. Dissertation. Stanford University.
- Gauthier, L. D. (2010). The false consensus effect: Projection or conformity? Ph.D. Dissertation. Stanford University.
- Abbasi, D. R. (2011). Americans and climate change: Elite understanding of the gap between science and action. Ph.D. Dissertation. Stanford University.
- Pasek, J. M. H. (2011). Communication through elections: Three studies exploring the determinants of citizen behavior. Ph.D. Dissertation. Stanford University.

- Larson, S. (2011). American concern for the environment: Survey question wording and why it matters for environmental policy. Honors Thesis. Stanford University.
- Lelkes, Y. (2012). Essays on the measurement of public opinion. Ph.D. Dissertation. Stanford University.
- Gross, W. (2012). Opinions about Hispanics: Causes and consequences. Ph.D. Dissertation. Stanford University.
- PonTell, E. (2012). Do sweets make you sweeter? Sweet food consumption and acquiescence response bias. Honors Thesis. Stanford University.
- Kim, N. (2013). Difference and Democracy: Encountering difference in Democratic dialogues. Ph.D. Dissertation. Stanford University.
- Eddy, G. M. (2013). Remedying a data deficit: A regression analysis of public opinion on healthcare reform. Honors Thesis. Stanford University.
- Cho, A. (2016). The psychology of economic voting: How voters use economic information to inform their political choices. Honors Thesis. Stanford University.
- Slavec, A. (2016). Improving survey question wording using language resources. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Ljubljana, Slovenia.
- Vannette, D. L. (2017). Predicting and influencing behavior with surveys. Ph.D. Dissertation. Stanford University.
- Kim, S. (2017). The influence of others: The impact of perceptions of others' opinions on individual attitudes and behavioral intentions. Ph.D. Dissertation. Stanford University.
- Höhne, J. K. (2017). Question format, response effort, and response quality – A methodological comparison of agree/disagree and item-specific questions. Ph.D. Dissertation. Georg-August-Universität Göttingen.

Professional Association Memberships

American Psychological Association
 Society of Experiment Social Psychology
 Society for Personal and Social Psychology
 American Political Science Association
 American Association for Public Opinion Research

Revised: December, 2018.

Appendix B
Survey Questionnaire

PROGRAMMING NOTES:

- Throughout, horizontal lines indicate page breaks
- Respondents will be randomly assigned to see one kind of dog food using the variable “fc”:
 - IF = 1, RESPONDENT WILL SEE ORIJEN SIX FISH
 - IF = 2, RESPONDENT WILL SEE ACANA DUCK AND PEAR SINGLES
- Respondents will be randomly assigned to see or not see one of eight sets of corrective information using the variable set “cc_”:
 - IF ccm = 1, MERCURY
 - IF ccc = 1, CADMIUM
 - IF ccl = 1, LEAD
 - IF cca = 1, ARSENIC
 - IF ccb = 1, BPA
 - IF ccf = 1, FRESH
 - IF ccr = 1, REGIONAL
 - IF cct = 1, THIRD PARTY
- Respondents will be randomly assigned to see one of five price points using the variable “pc”:
 - IF = 1, DISPLAY PRICE DECREASE 2
 - IF = 2, DISPLAY PRICE DECREASE 1
 - IF = 3, DISPLAY BASE PRICE
 - IF = 4, DISPLAY PRICE INCREASE 1
 - IF = 5, DISPLAY PRICE INCREASE 2
- A unique respondent identifier “p” will be passed through by NORC, captured as a URL variable and passed back at the end of the survey.
- IF ONE OR MORE URL VARIABLES ARE MISSING, DISPLAY THE FOLLOWING: “There has been an error in the survey. In order to continue, you must go back to the email invitation you received and click on the link you see there. The survey will begin again once you click on the link in your invitation.”
- RECORD THE NUMBER OF SECONDS THAT EACH RESPONDENT SAW EACH SCREEN.
- IF A RESPONDENT SKIPS A QUESTION WITHOUT ANSWERING IT, REDISPLAY THE SCREEN AND PUT THE FOLLOWING TEXT IN YELLOW AT THE TOP OF THE SCREEN: “We noticed that you didn’t answer the question below. We would be really grateful if you’d be willing to answer it as accurately as you can, even if you’re not completely sure of your answer. But if you prefer not to answer the question, just click on the blue button below.”
- If a respondent removes the passthrough variables that indicate condition, the following message will be displayed “There has been an error in the survey. In order to continue, you must go back to the email invitation you received and click on the link you see there.”

The survey will begin again once you click on the link in your invitation.

INTRO1. Thank you for participating in this research.

Please complete this questionnaire all at one time without taking a break - it should take you about 25 minutes.

After you answer each question, you can move on to the next question by clicking the blue button at the bottom of the screen.

INTRO2. Please do not click your browser's forward or back button. If you do, you will have to start the questionnaire again from the beginning.

DOG_EVER. To begin, have you ever owned a dog, or have you never owned a dog?

- Have owned a dog
 - Have never owned a dog
-

PRODUCT_INSTRUCTION.

On the next screens, you will see pictures of a dog food sold in the U.S.

Please look at each picture carefully. After you have finished looking at each picture, please click the blue button to move to the next screen.

DISPLAY IF $f_c = 1$

This is the front of the bag



DISPLAY IF $f_c = 1$

This is a close-up of the top part of the front of the bag



DISPLAY IF $f_c = 1$

This is a close-up of the middle part of the front of the bag



DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

This is a close-up of the bottom part of the front of the bag



DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

On the next few screens, you will see the words that are printed on the front of the bag you just saw. Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

EASY OPEN LIFT AND PULL TAB TO YOUR RIGHT

DO NOT CUT

Orijen NOURISH AS NATURE INTENDED

NEW ENGLAND'S VAST ATLANTIC WATERS-OUR SOURCE OF INSPIRATION AND FRESH REGIONAL FISH

WHOLEPREY™ DIET

FISH | ORGANS | CARTILAGE

85% WILD-CAUGHT FISH INGREDIENTS

15% VEGETABLES | FRUITS | BOTANICALS + ZINC OUR ONLY SUPPLEMENT

0% GRAIN | POTATO | TAPIOCA | PLANT PROTEIN CONCENTRATES

FRESH, RAW OR DEHYDRATED FISH INGREDIENTS | NO RENDERED FISH, POULTRY OR MEAT MEALS

Six Fish

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ DOG FOOD

MADE WITH SIX WILD AND SUSTAINABLY CAUGHT FISH DELIVERED DAILY

NEW ENGLAND HERRING, FLOUNDER, MACKEREL, REDFISH, MONKFISH AND ALASKAN COD

BA

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™

PROTEIN-RICH | CARBOHYDRATE-LIMITED*

RF

NO RENDERED MEALS

NO RENDERED FISH MEAL

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

6 FRESH OR RAW

TOP 6 FRESH OR RAW

WILD AND SUSTAINABLY CAUGHT

WHOLEPREY™ DIET

FISH | ORGANS | CARTILAGE

FD

FREEZE-DRIED LIVER

INFUSED FOR NATURAL FLAVOR

MADE IN OUR USA KENTUCKY KITCHENS | PREPARED WITH PRIDE FROM TRUSTED REGIONAL
INGREDIENTS

*MAXIMUM 20% CARBOHYDRATE (AS ESTIMATED BY NFE)

Orijen

NOURISH AS NATURE INTENDED

Six Fish

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ DOG FOOD

NET WEIGHT 13 LB | 5.9 KG

WHOLEPREY™ DIET | 85 15 0

DOG FOOD

FOR ALL BREEDS AND LIFE STAGES

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

This is the back of the bag



DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

This is a close-up of the top part of the back of the bag



DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

This is a close-up of the middle part of the back of the bag



DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

This is a close-up of the bottom part of the back of the bag



DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

On the next few screens, you will see the words that are printed on the back of the bag you saw earlier. Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

DISPLAY IF $f_c = 1$

Orijen

NOURISH AS NATURE INTENDED

AWARD-WINNING BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ DOG FOOD 2014

LEADERSHIP AWARDS “FOOD INNOVATION” 2015

ALBERTA AWARD OF DISTINCTION 2015

ALBERTA EXPORT AWARD FOR CONSUMER PRODUCTS 2015

TOP 10 BEST DOG FOOD BRANDS REVIEWS.COM 2015

INNOVATION AWARD PETFOOD & ANIMAL NUTRITION 2.0 2015-2016

EXCELLENCE IN CANINE PET FOOD

GLYCEMIC RESEARCH INSTITUTE WASHINGTON DC

TRUSTED EVERYWHERE.

TRUSTED BY PET LOVERS EVERYWHERE, ORIJEN IS THE FULLEST EXPRESSION OF OUR BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ AND FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS COMMITMENT.

ORIJEN SIX FISH is brimming with unmatched inclusions of wild-caught New England fish, sustainably harvested by people we know and trust, and delivered daily-WHOLE, FRESH or RAW, and preservative-free, so they’re bursting with goodness and taste.

Prepared exclusively in our Kentucky DogStar® kitchens, award-winning ORIJEN is guaranteed to keep your cherished dog healthy, happy and strong.

Reinhard Muhlenfeld

Founder

DISPLAY IF $f_c = 1$

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™

NOURISH AS NATURE INTENDED-ORIJEN mirrors the richness, freshness and variety of WholePrey™ meats that dogs are evolved to eat.

FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

GROWN CLOSE TO HOME-We focus on local ingredients that are ethically raised by people we know and trust, and delivered to our kitchens fresh or raw each day.

NEVER OUTSOURCED

PREPARED EXCLUSIVELY IN OUR DOGSTAR® KITCHENS-We don't make foods for other companies and we don't allow our foods to be made by anyone else.

PEOPLE WE TRUST

INGREDIENTS WE LOVE FROM PEOPLE WE KNOW AND TRUST

EOIN OF NORPEL FISHERIES IN NEW ENGLAND. TRUSTED SUPPLIER OF FRESH REGIONAL FISH.

OUR DOGSTAR® KITCHENS

AWARD-WINNING FOODS

AWARD-WINNING KITCHENS

ANNA, JEFF AND OUR 25,000 SQUARE FOOT COOLER. OUR KENTUCKY DOGSTAR® KITCHENS.

FRESH AND REGIONAL

DELIVERED DAILY FRESH OR RAW

WILD-CAUGHT NEW ENGLAND FISH. DELIVERED FRESH OR RAW DAILY.

DISPLAY IF $f_c = 1$

THIS 13 LB PACKAGE OF ORIJEN IS MADE WITH OVER 11 LB* OF FRESH, RAW OR DEHYDRATED FISH INGREDIENTS *APPROXIMATE INCLUSIONS.

2/3 FRESH OR RAW. 1/3 DRIED OR OILS.

5 LB* FRESH, RAW OR DRIED WILD ATLANTIC HERRING

1 2/3 LB* FRESH, RAW OR DRIED WILD YELLOW TAIL FLOUNDER

1 1/3 LB* FRESH, RAW OR DRIED WILD ATLANTIC MACKEREL

2/3 LB* FRESH OR RAW WILD ACADIAN RED FISH

2/3 LB* FRESH OR RAW WILD MONKFISH

2/3 LB* FRESH OR RAW WILD ALASKAN COD

• PLUS 1 1/4 LB* DEHYDRATED ANCHOVY, SARDINE AND SALMON •

WHOLEPREY™ DIET

FISH | ORGANS | CARTILAGE

IN HER INFINITE WISDOM, MOTHER NATURE MATCHED THE NUTRIENTS IN WHOLE PREY ANIMALS TO PERFECTLY MEET YOUR DOG'S DIETARY NEEDS.

That's why ORIJEN features richly nourishing whole fish that provide a concentrated source of virtually every nutrient your dog needs to thrive, naturally, without long lists of synthetic supplements-only zinc is added.

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

RF

NO RENDERED FISH MEALS

MADE WITH FRESH, RAW OR DEHYDRATED FISH INGREDIENTS

RENDERED FISH MEALS ARE PROCESSED AT HIGH TEMPERATURES, TYPICALLY FROM INGREDIENTS UNFIT FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION.

Orijen features FRESH, RAW OR DEHYDRATED fish ingredients, minimally processed at lower temperatures from wild-caught fish that are deemed fit for human consumption prior to inclusion in our foods.

MADE IN OUR USA KENTUCKY KITCHENS

AWARD-WINNING BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ DOG FOOD

Orijen Six Fish

MODERN DOGS ARE BUILT JUST LIKE THEIR ANCESTORS, POSSESSING A BIOLOGICAL NEED FOR A DIET THAT'S RICH AND VARIED IN NOURISHING ANIMAL PROTEIN.

That's why we loaded ORIJEN SIX FISH with unmatched inclusions of wild-caught fish – whisked to our kitchens from cold New England waters FRESH or RAW, in richly nourishing WholePrey™ ratios.

Biologically Appropriate™ ORIJEN keeps your dog happy and strong. Read our ingredients and you'll be happy too!

DISPLAY IF $f_c = 1$

INGREDIENTS

Whole atlantic herring, yellowtail flounder, whole atlantic mackerel, whole acadian redfish, atlantic monkfish, alaskan cod, dehydrated yellowtail flounder, dehydrated anchovy, dehydrated atlantic herring, dehydrated atlantic mackerel, dehydrated sardine, dehydrated atlantic salmon, sunflower oil, whole green peas, whole navy beans, red lentils, herring oil, pinto beans, chickpeas, green lentils, alfalfa, natural fish flavor, safflower oil, dried kelp, freeze-dried cod liver, whole pumpkin, whole butternut squash, kale, spinach, mustard greens, collard greens, turnip greens, whole carrots, apples, pears, pumpkin seeds, sunflower seeds, zinc proteinate, mixed tocopherols (preservative), chicory root, turmeric, sarsaparilla root, althea root, rosehips, juniper berries, dried lactobacillus acidophilus fermentation product, dried bifidobacterium animalis fermentation product, dried lactobacillus casei fermentation product.

GUARANTEED ANALYSIS

Crude protein (min.)	38%
Crude fat (min.)	18%
Crude fiber (max.)	4%
Moisture (max.)	12%
Calcium (min.)	1%
Phosphorus (min.)	0.9%
Omega-6 fatty acids* (min.)	2.3%
Omega-3 fatty acids* (min.)	2%
DHA* (docosahexaenoic acid) (min.)	0.6%
EPA* (eicosapentaenoic acid) (min.)	0.6%
Glucosamine* (min.)	800 mg/kg
Chondroitin sulfate* (min.)	600 mg/kg

*not recognized as an essential nutrient by the AAFCO Dog Food Nutrient Profiles

DISPLAY IF $f_c = 1$

CALORIE CONTENT

Calorie content (calculated): ME 3940 kcal/kg. 449 kcal per 8 oz. cup.

Calories distributed to support peak conditioning with 39% from protein, 20% from vegetables and fruits, and 41% from fat.

ORIJEN SIX FISH DOG FOOD IS FORMULATED TO MEET THE NUTRITIONAL LEVELS ESTABLISHED BY THE AAFCO DOG FOOD NUTRIENT PROFILES FOR ALL LIFE STAGES.

Champion Petfoods® World's Best Petfood

MADE BY CHAMPION PETFOODS USA INC.

12871 BOWLING GREEN ROAD

AUBURN, KENTUCKY 42206

DOGSTAR® KITCHENS

CHAMPIONPETFOODS.COM

EU REG.

CUSTOMER CARE [USA]

TOLL FREE 1.877.939.0006

FOLLOW US ONLINE

@ORIJENPETFOOD

@CHAMPIONPETFOOD

ORIJEN SIX FISH FOR DOGS

13LB | 5.9KG

ORIJEN.CA

DISPLAY IF $f_c = 1$

This is one side of the bag



DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

On the next screen, you will see the words that are printed on one side of the bag you saw earlier. Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

MADE IN OUR USA KENTUCKY KITCHENS

DAILY RATION AND FEEDING GUIDE

8 OZ CUP IS 114G OF FOOD

DOG WEIGHT		LESS ACTIVE 1 hour or LESS daily exercise		ACTIVE 1 hour or MORE daily exercise	
LB	KG	CUPS/DAY	GR/DAY	CUPS/DAY	GR/DAY
4 1/2 lb	2 kg	1/4 c	28 g	1/3 c	38 g
11 lb	5 kg	1/2 c	57 g	3/4 c	86 g
22 lb	10 kg	3/4 c	86 g	1 1/3 c	152 g
44 lb	20 kg	1 1/2 c	171 g	2 1/4 c	257 g
66 lb	30 kg	2 c	228 g	3 c	342 g
88 lb	40 kg	2 1/2 c	285 g	3 3/4 c	428 g
110 lb	50 kg	3 c	342 g	4 1/2 c	513 g
132 lb	60 kg	3 1/3 c	380 g	5 c	570 g

EVERY DOG IS DIFFERENT.

Just like you, your dog is a unique individual with feeding requirements that will vary with environment, age and activity.

This chart provides an initial guide, and we suggest monitoring your dog's weight and adjusting amounts as needed. Feed twice daily, and always keep fresh, clean water available.

PUPPIES: at 1 1/2-3 months old feed twice the adult amount. At 3- 6 months feed 1 1/2 times the adult amount. At 6-11 months feed 1 1/4 times the adult amount.

GESTATION: increase from 25% to 50% of the adult amount. LACTATION: feed 'free choice'.

ORIJEN SIX FISH DOG FOOD is formulated to meet the nutritional levels established by the AAFCO Dog Food Nutrient Profiles for all life stages.

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

This is the other side of the bag



DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

On the next screen, you will see the words that are printed on the other side of the bag you saw earlier. Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

Six Fish

WHOLEPREY™ DIET | 85 15 0

MADE IN OUR USA KENTUCKY KITCHENS

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

This is the front of the bag



DISPLAY IF $f_c = 2$

This is a close-up of the top part of the front of the bag



DISPLAY IF $f_c = 2$

This is a close-up of the middle part of the front of the bag



DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

This is a close-up of the bottom part of the front of the bag



DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

On the next few screens, you will see the words that are printed on the front of the bag you just saw. Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

EASY OPEN

LIFT AND PULL TAB TO YOUR RIGHT

DO NOT CUT

UNMATCHED REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

FRESH OR RAW

SINGLE ANIMAL PROTEIN from FREE-RUN MUSCOVY DUCK

MUSCOVY DUCK Christian County, Kentucky

BARTLETT PEAR Louisville, Kentucky

SARSAPARILLA Hart County, Kentucky

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ RATIOS

50% FREE-RUN DUCK INGREDIENTS

INCLUDING DUCK, LIVER, GIBLETS AND CARTILAGE

50% VEGETABLES, FRUITS & BOTANICALS

PLUS ZINC PROTEINATE-OUR ONE AND ONLY SUPPLEMENT

0% NO GRAIN, POTATO, TAPIOCA

GLUTENS OR ANY OTHER PLANT PROTEIN CONCENTRATES

1

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

WHOLEPREY™ SINGLE

DUCK | ORGANS | CARTILAGE

ACANA®

SINGLES

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ | SINGLE ANIMAL PROTEIN

DUCK & PEAR SINGLES FORMULA

with FREE-RUN MUSCOVY DUCK & FRESH BARTLETT PEARS

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ | SINGLE ANIMAL PROTEIN

BA

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™

PROTEIN RICH, CARBOHYDRATE LIMITED*

1

WHOLEPREY™ SINGLE

FLESH, LIVER & CARTILAGE FROM DUCK

1

DISPLAY IF $f_c = 2$

FIRST INGREDIENT

FROM FRESH OR RAW MUSCOVY DUCK

FD

HIGH PALATABILITY

INFUSED WITH FREEZE-DRIED DUCK LIVER

FRESH AND LOCAL

KENTUCKY GROWN VEGETABLES, FRUITS AND BOTANICALS

*MAXIMUM 30% CARBOHYDRATE (AS ESTIMATED BY NFE)

COMPLETE FOOD FOR DOGS

ALL BREEDS | ALL LIFE STAGES

NET WEIGHT

13 LB | 5.9 KG

KENTUCKY'S FERTILE FARMS AND ORCHARDS

OUR SOURCE OF INSPIRATION AND FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

MADE IN OUR USA KENTUCKY KITCHENS

PREPARED WITH PRIDE FROM TRUSTED REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

ACANA®

SINGLES

DUCK & PEAR SINGLES FORMULA

with FREE-RUN MUSCOVY DUCK & FRESH BARTLETT PEARS

COMPLETE FOOD FOR DOGS

ALL BREEDS | ALL LIFE STAGES

DISPLAY IF $f_c = 2$

This is the back of the bag



DISPLAY IF $f_c = 2$

This is a close-up of the top part of the back of the bag



This is a close-up of the middle part of the back of the bag



This is a close-up of the bottom part of the back of the bag



On the next few screens, you will see the words that are printed on the back of the bag you saw earlier. Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

ACANA®

ACANA®

OUR MISSION IS CLEAR AND STRONG.

At Champion, we've been making BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ dog foods from FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS since 1985.

Our ACANA SINGLES are Biologically Appropriate™ and Limited Ingredient foods, featuring a single source of animal protein from ranch-raised lamb, free-run duck, yorkshire pork or wild-caught mackerel-all farmed, fished or ranched by people we trust and delivered to our kitchens FRESH or RAW, so they're bursting with goodness and taste.

Reinhard Muhlenfeld

Founder

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™

Our foods mirror the richness, freshness and variety of meats for which DOGS ARE EVOLVED TO EAT.

FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

We focus on fresh ingredients from our region that are ranched, raised or fished by people we know and trust.

NEVER OUTSOURCED

We prepare our OWN FOODS in our OWN KITCHENS and we DON'T make foods for anyone else.

SINGLES

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ | SINGLE ANIMAL PROTEIN

INGREDIENTS WE LOVE

PEOPLE WE TRUST

FOOD CHOICES ARE SOME OF OUR MOST IMPORTANT DECISIONS AND THESE DAYS, KNOWING WHERE YOUR FOOD IS FROM HAS TAKEN ON NEW IMPORTANCE.

That's why we make ACANA in our own kitchens, from fresh, regional ingredients raised by people we know and trust, like Brandon and Amie of Hoover Farms in Pembroke, Kentucky-trusted suppliers of fresh free-run Muscovy duck.

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

BRANDON AND AMIE OF HOOVER FARMS IN PEMBROKE, KENTUCKY. TRUSTED SUPPLIERS OF FRESH FREE-RUN MUSCOVY DUCK.

Made with UNMATCHED REGIONAL INGREDIENTS DELIVERED FRESH

DUCK & PEAR SINGLES FORMULA WITH FREE-RUN KENTUCKY DUCK & FRESH BARTLETT PEARS

COMPLETE FOOD FOR DOGS

ALL BREEDS | ALL LIFE STAGES

ALL DOGS EVOLVED AS CARNIVORES, BIOLOGICALLY ADAPTED TO A DIET RICH IN MEAT AND PROTEINS. THAT'S WHY ACANA DUCK & PEAR FORMULA IS LOADED WITH 50% DUCK INGREDIENTS TO NOURISH YOUR DOG ACCORDING TO HIS EVOLUTIONARY NEEDS WHILE LIMITING HIS EXPOSURE TO A SINGLE ANIMAL PROTEIN.

Raised free-run on local Kentucky farms, our fresh Muscovy duck arrives in WholePrey™ ratios- a richly nourishing ratio of duck, liver, giblets and cartilage that deliver nutrients naturally, virtually eliminating the need for additives. Generous infusions of freeze-dried duck liver make this delicious food a perfect choice for fussy dogs.

Prepared in our Kentucky kitchens from fresh regional ingredients, this unique Biologically Appropriate™ and Limited Ingredient food is guaranteed to keep your cherished dog happy and strong. Read our ingredients and we think you'll agree!

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

INGREDIENTS

Deboned duck, duck meal, whole green peas, red lentils, duck liver, duck fat, pinto beans, chickpeas, herring oil, green lentils, whole yellow peas, duck giblets (liver, heart, kidney), pears, sun-cured alfalfa, natural duck flavor, duck cartilage, dried kelp, freeze-dried duck liver, whole pumpkin, whole butternut squash, kale, spinach, mustard greens, collard greens, turnip greens, carrots, apples, pumpkin seeds, sunflower seeds, zinc proteinate, mixed tocopherols (preservative), chicory root, turmeric, sarsaparilla root, althea root, rosehips, juniper berries, dried lactobacillus acidophilus fermentation product, dried bifidobacterium animalis fermentation product, dried lactobacillus casei fermentation product.

CALORIE CONTENT (calculated): Metabolizable Energy is 3475 kcal/kg (396 kcal per standard 8 oz cup).

Calories are distributed to support peak conditioning with 27% from protein, 31% from fruits and vegetables, and 42% from fat.

GUARANTEED ANALYSIS

Crude protein (min.)	27%
Crude fat (min.)	17%
Crude fiber (max.)	6%
Moisture (max.)	12%
Calcium (min.)	1.1%
Phosphorus (min.)	0.8%
Omega-6* (min.)	2.2%
Omega-3* (min.)	0.8%
DHA* (docosahexaenoic acid) (min.)	0.15%
EPA* (eicosapentaenoic acid) (min.)	0.1%
Glucosamine* (min.)	1200 mg/kg
Chondroitin sulfate* (min.)	1000 mg/kg

*not recognized as an essential nutrient by the AAFCO Dog Food Nutrient Profiles

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

DAILY RATION AND FEEDING GUIDE

8 OZ CUP IS 114 G OF FOOD

DOG WEIGHT		LESS ACTIVE 1 hour or LESS daily exercise		ACTIVE 1 hour or MORE daily exercise	
LB	KG	CUPS/DAY	GR/DAY	CUPS/DAY	GR/DAY
4 lb	2 kg	1/3 c	38 g	1/2 c	57 g
11 lb	5 kg	2/3 c	76 g	1 c	114 g
22 lb	10 kg	1 c	114 g	1 1/2 c	171 g
44 lb	20 kg	1 2/3 c	190 g	2 1/2 c	285 g
66 lb	30 kg	2 1/3 c	266 g	3 1/2 c	399 g
88 lb	40 kg	3 c	342 g	4 1/4 c	485 g
110 lb	50 kg	3 1/3 c	380 g	5 c	570 g
132 lb	60 kg	4 c	456 g	5 3/4 c	656 g

EVERY DOG IS DIFFERENT. FEEDING AMOUNT WILL VARY WITH AGE AND ACTIVITY.

Use this chart as an initial guide and adjust amounts accordingly.

Feed twice daily and always provide fresh clean water.

PUPPIES: at 1 1/2-3 months old feed twice the adult amount, at 3-6 months feed 1 1/2 times the adult amount. At 6-11 months feed 1 1/4 times the adult amount.

GESTATION: increase from 25% to 50% of the adult amount.

LACTATION: feed 'free choice'.

ACANA DUCK & PEAR SINGLES FORMULA is formulated to meet the nutritional levels established by the AAFCO Dog Food Nutrient Profiles for All Life Stages.

THIS 13 LB PACKAGE OF ACANA IS MADE WITH 6 1/2 LBS FREE-RUN DUCK INGREDIENTS

3 1/4 LBS FRESH OR RAW

HALF IS FRESH or RAW and bursting with goodness and taste, and HALF IS DRIED or OILS to provide a strong and natural source of duck protein and fat.

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

LIMITED INGREDIENTS SHOULDN'T MEAN LESS DUCK

1

WHOLEPREY™ SINGLES

DUCK | ORGAN | CARTILAGE

IN HER ETERNAL WISDOM, NATURE MATCHED THE NUTRIENTS FOUND IN WHOLE PREY ANIMALS TO PERFECTLY MEET THE NEEDS OF YOUR DOG.

Mirroring Mother Nature, ACANA WholePrey™ foods feature a richly nourishing balance of duck, organs and cartilage that reflect the whole prey animal, DELIVERING NUTRIENTS NATURALLY.

That's why you won't find long lists of additives in ACANA foods.

OUR INGREDIENTS.

OUR KITCHENS.

OUR FOOD.

TRUSTED EVERYWHERE.

SCOTTY AND ROBIN OF CEDAR VALLEY FARMS IN HODGENVILLE, KENTUCKY.

TRUSTED SUPPLIER OF FRESH WHOLE BUTTERNUT SQUASH.

Kentucky Proud

Champion PetFoods®

World's Best Petfood

MADE IN KENTUCKY BY CHAMPION PETFOODS USA INC.

12871 BOWLING GREEN ROAD, AUBURN, KENTUCKY 42206

EU REG.

CONSUMER CARE

TOLL FREE 1.877.939.0006

FOLLOW US ONLINE

@ACANAPETFOOD @CHAMPIONPETFOOD

DUCK & PEAR SINGLES FORMULA

13LB | 5.9KG

CHAMPIONPETFOODS.COM

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

This is one side of the bag



DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

On the next screen, you will see the words that are printed on one side of the bag you saw earlier. Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

UNMATCHED REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

FRESH OR RAW

SINGLE ANIMAL PROTEIN from FREE-RUN MUSCOVY DUCK

SINGLES

DUCK & PEAR SINGLES FORMULA

with FREE-RUN MUSCOVY DUCK & FRESH BARTLETT PEARS

COMPLETE FOOD FOR DOGS

ALL BREEDS | ALL LIFE STAGES

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

This is the other side of the bag



DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

On the next screen, you will see the words that are printed on the other side of the bag you saw earlier. Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

MADE IN USA

Made with unmatched REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

KENTUCKY KITCHENS

SINGLES

DUCK & PEAR SINGLES FORMULA

with FREE-RUN MUSCOVY DUCK & FRESH BARTLETT PEARS

COMPLETE FOOD FOR DOGS

ALL BREEDS | ALL LIFE STAGES

NEXT, YOU WILL READ SOME INFORMATION ABOUT THE DOG FOOD THAT IS NOT ON THE PACKAGE.

BEGIN CC BLOCK. RANDOMIZE ORDER OF PAGES IN THIS BLOCK.

DISPLAY PAGE IF ccm = 1

Laboratory testing has shown there is a risk that this food may contain mercury. The World Health Organization has said that in humans, “Mercury may have toxic effects on the nervous, digestive and immune systems, and on lungs, kidneys, skin and eyes.”

DISPLAY PAGE IF ccc = 1

Laboratory testing has shown there is a risk that this food may contain cadmium. A federal public health agency of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, has found, “Kidney and bone effects have also been observed in laboratory animals ingesting cadmium. Anemia, liver disease, and nerve or brain damage have been observed in animals eating or drinking cadmium.”

DISPLAY PAGE IF ccl = 1

Laboratory testing has shown there is a risk that this food may contain lead. The Food & Drug Administration has said, “Lead is poisonous to humans and can affect people of any age or health status.”

DISPLAY PAGE IF cca = 1

Laboratory testing has shown there is a risk that this food may contain arsenic. The Environmental Protection Agency has said, "Arsenic has been linked to a number of cancers. These include cancer of the bladder, lungs, skin, kidney, nasal passages, liver, and prostate."

DISPLAY PAGE IF ccb = 1

Laboratory testing has shown there is a risk that this food may contain BPA. The Food & Drug Administration has said, "BPA is an industrial chemical used to make polycarbonate, a hard, clear plastic, which is used in many consumer products."

DISPLAY PAGE IF ccf = 1

The manufacturer of this food has stated that it may include ingredients that are not delivered to them fresh but have been frozen before they are used to make the dog food.

DISPLAY PAGE IF ccr = 1

The manufacturer of this food has stated that it may include ingredients that are sourced outside the region where it is manufactured. This may include not only other regions within the United States but also other regions internationally.

DISPLAY PAGE IF cct = 1

The manufacturer of this food has stated that it uses third parties to process and manufacture protein meals and tallows used in its dog foods.

END CC BLOCK

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1 & fc = 1 & pc = 1

fc1_pc1. If you were buying dog food today, and the 13 pound bag of dog food you just saw is available at a price of \$47.99, would you buy it, or would you not buy it?

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1 & fc = 2 & pc = 1

fc2_pc1. If you were buying dog food today, and the 13 pound bag of dog food you just saw is available at a price of \$37.99, would you buy it, or would you not buy it?

- Would buy it
 - Would not buy it
-

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1 & fc = 1 & PC = 2

fc1_pc2. If you were buying dog food today, and the 13 pound bag of dog food you just saw is available at a price of \$50.99, would you buy it, or would you not buy it?

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1 & fc = 2 & PC = 2

fc2_pc2. If you were buying dog food today, and the 13 pound bag of dog food you just saw is available at a price of \$39.99, would you buy it, or would you not buy it?

- Would buy it
 - Would not buy it
-

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1 & fc = 1 & PC = 3

fc1_pc3. If you were buying dog food today, and the 13 pound bag of dog food you just saw is available at a price of \$53.49, would you buy it, or would you not buy it?

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1 & fc = 2 & PC = 3

fc2_pc3. If you were buying dog food today, and the 13 pound bag of dog food you just saw is available at a price of \$41.99, would you buy it, or would you not buy it?

- Would buy it
 - Would not buy it
-

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1 & fc = 1 & PC = 4

fc1_pc4. If you were buying dog food today, and the 13 pound bag of dog food you just saw is available at a price of \$55.99, would you buy it, or would you not buy it?

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1 & fc = 2 & PC = 4

fc2_pc4. If you were buying dog food today, and the 13 pound bag of dog food you just saw is available at a price of \$43.99, would you buy it, or would you not buy it?

- Would buy it
 - Would not buy it
-

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1 & fc = 1 & PC = 5

fc1_pc5. If you were buying dog food today, and the 13 pound bag of dog food you just saw is available at a price of \$58.99, would you buy it, or would you not buy it?

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1 & fc = 2 & PC = 5

fc2_pc5. If you were buying dog food, and the 13lb bag of dog food you just saw was available for sale at a price of \$45.99 would you buy it, or would you not buy it?

- Would buy it
 - Would not buy it
-

QUALITY. How would you rate the **quality** of this dog food? Excellent, good, fair, poor, or very poor?

- Excellent
 - Good
 - Fair
 - Poor
 - Very poor
-

HEALTHY. How **healthy** would you say this dog food is? Extremely healthy, very healthy, moderately healthy, slightly healthy, or not healthy at all?

- Extremely healthy
 - Very healthy
 - Moderately healthy
 - Slightly healthy
 - Not healthy at all
-

FOOD_EVER. Did you ever buy dog food, or did you never do that?

- Bought dog food
 - Never bought dog food
-

DISPLAY IF FOOD_EVER = 1

FOOD_CLASS. Did you buy dog food after July 1, 2013, or did you not buy dog food then?

- Bought dog food after July 1, 2013
 - Did not buy dog food after July 1, 2013
-

DISPLAY IF $f_c = 1$ AND FOOD_EVER = 1

The dog food you looked at is called Orijen Six Fish.

DISPLAY IF $f_c = 2$ AND FOOD_EVER = 1

The dog food you looked at is called Acana Duck and Pear Singles.

SPEC_BUY. Did you ever buy that type of dog food, or did you never buy it?

- Did buy it
 - Did not buy it
-

DISPLAY IF SPEC_BUY = 1 & FOOD_CLASS = 1

SPEC_CLASS. Did you buy this dog food after July 1, 2013, or did you NOT buy this dog food after that date?

- Did buy it after July 1, 2013
 - Did not do that
-

DISPLAY IF FOOD_COND = 2 & FOOD_EVER = 1 OR FOOD_COND = 1 & SPEC_BUY = 2

ORIJEN_BUY. Did you ever buy dog food that had the word “Orijen” written on the package, or did you never do that?

- Did buy it
- Did not buy it

DISPLAY IF ORIEN_BUY = 1

ORIEN_CLASS. Did you buy dog food that had the word “Orijen” written on the package after July 1, 2013, or did you not do that?

- Did buy it
- Did not buy it

DISPLAY IF FOOD_COND = 1 & FOOD_EVER = 1 OR FOOD_COND = 2 & SPEC_PURCH = 2

ACANA_BUY. Did you ever buy dog food that had the word “Acana” written on the package, or did you never do that?

- Did buy it
- Did not buy it

DISPLAY IF ACANA_BUY = 1

ACANA_CLASS. Did you buy dog food that had the word “Acana” written on the package after July 1, 2013, or did you not do that?

- Did buy it
- Did not buy it

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1

DOG_NUM. What is the total number of dogs you have owned since you were 18 years old?

RECORD NUMBER

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1

DOG_CURR. Do you own that dog now, or do you not own it now?

- Own it now
- Do not own it now

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1

DOGS_CURR. Do you own one of those dogs now, or do you not own any of those dogs now?

- Own one or more dogs now
 - Do not own any dogs now
-

DISPLAY IF DOG_CURR = 2

DOG_CLASS. Did you own that dog before July 1, 2013, or did you not own it then?

- Owned dog before July 1, 2013
 - Did not own dog before July 1, 2013
-

DISPLAY IF DOGS_CURR = 2

DOGS_CLASS. Did you own any of those dogs before July 1, 2013, or did you not own any of them then?

- Owned one or more dogs before July 1, 2013
 - Did not own any dogs before July 1, 2013
-

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1 & DOG_CURR = 1

WEIGHT1A. In the box below, please type how many pounds your dog has weighed, on average, during the time you have owned it.

DISPLAY ONE BOX

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1 & DOG_CURR = 2

WEIGHT1B. In the box below, please type how many pounds your dog weighed, on average, during the time you have owned it.

DISPLAY ONE BOX

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1 AND DOG_NUM < 21

PROGRAMMING NOTE: IN THE QUESTION BELOW, X WILL BE REPLACED WITH THE NUMBER OF DOGS OWNED

WEIGHTX. In the boxes below, please type how many pounds each of your dogs weighed, on average, during the time you have owned it.

DISPLAY ONE BOX FOR EACH DOG OWNED, UP TO 20

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1 & DOG_CURR = 2

DOG_FRIEND_PAST. Would you say your dog was your friend, or would you not say that?

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1 & DOG_CURR = 1

DOG_FRIEND_PRES. Would you say your dog is your friend, or would you not say that?

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM >1

DOGS_FRIEND_PAST. Would you say any of your dogs were your friend, or would you not say that?

- Would say that
 - Would not say that
-

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1 & DOG_CURR = 2

DOG_FAMILY_PAST. Would you say your dog was a member of your family, or would you not say that?

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1 & DOG_CURR = 1

DOG_FAMILY_PRES. Would you say your dog is a member of your family, or would you not say that?

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM >1

DOGS_FAMILY. Would you say any of your dogs were a member of your family, or would you not say that?

- Would say that
- Would not say that

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1

DOG_BED. Did you ever allow your dog to be on the bed where you slept, or did you never do that?

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM >1

DOGS_BED. Did you ever allow any of your dogs to be on the bed where you slept, or did you never do that?

- Did that
- Never did that

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1

DOG_PHOTO. Did you ever pay a professional photographer to take pictures of your dog, or did you never do that?

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM >1

DOGS_PHOTO. Did you ever pay a professional photographer to take pictures of any of your dogs, or did you never do that?

- Did that
- Never did that

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1

DOG_PARK. Did you ever take your dog to a fenced-in area of a public park where dogs can run without being on leashes, or did you never do that?

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM >1

DOGS_PARK. Did you ever take any of your dogs to a fenced-in area of a public park where dogs can run without being on leashes, or did you never do that?

- Did that
- Never did that

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1 & DOG_CURR = 1

DOG_HEALTHY_PRES. How important to you is it that your dog is as **healthy** as possible? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1 & DOG_CURR = 2

DOG_HEALTHY_PAST. How important to you was it that your dog was as **healthy** as possible? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM >1 & DOG_CURR = 1

DOGS_HEALTHY_PRES. How important to you is that your dogs are as **healthy** as possible? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM >1 & DOG_CURR = 2

DOGS_HEALTHY_PAST. How important to you was it that your dogs were as **healthy** as possible? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

- Extremely important
- Very important
- Moderately important
- Slightly important
- Not important at all

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1 & DOG_CURR = 1

DOG_SAFE_PRES. How important to you is it that your dog is as **safe** as possible? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1 & DOG_CURR = 2

DOG_SAFE_PAST. How important to you was it that your dog was as **safe** as possible? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM >1 & DOG_CURR = 1

DOGS_SAFE_PRES. How important to you is that your dogs are as **safe** as possible? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM >1 & DOG_CURR = 2

DOGS_SAFE_PAST. How important to you was it that your dogs were as **safe** as possible? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

- Extremely important
- Very important
- Moderately important
- Slightly important
- Not important at all

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1

DOG_VET. Did you ever take your dog to a veterinarian when it was not sick or injured, to find out if it was generally healthy, or did you never do that?

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1

DOGS_VET. Did you ever take any of your dogs to a veterinarian when they were not sick or injured, to find out if they were generally healthy, or did you never do that?

- Did that
- Never did that

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1

DOG_TEETH. Did you ever have your dog's teeth cleaned at a veterinarian's office, or did you never do that?

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM >1

DOGS_TEETH. Did you ever have any of your dogs' teeth cleaned at a veterinarian's office, or did you never do that?

- Did that
 - Never did that
-

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1

DOG_MED. Did you ever give your dog a medicine prescribed by a veterinarian, or did you never do that?

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1

DOGS_MED. Did you ever give any of your dogs a medication prescribed by a veterinarian, or did you never do that?

- Did that
 - Never did that
-

DISPLAY IF FOOD_EVER = 1 & DOG_EVER = 1

FOOD_VETREC. Did you ever buy a dog food that was recommended to you by a veterinarian, or did you never do that?

- Did that
 - Never did that
-

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM =1

DOG_CHIPPED. Did you ever have someone put a microchip in your dog so you could find it, or did you never do that?

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1

DOGS_CHIPPED. Did you ever have someone put a microchip in any of your dogs so you could find it, or did you never do that?

- Did that

- Never did that

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 0

BOOKS_HEALTH. Did you ever read books, magazines, or information online to learn about how to keep dogs healthy, or did you never do that?

- Did that
- Never did that

DISPLAY IF FOOD_EVER = 1 & DOG_EVER = 1

FOOD_PETSTORE. Did you ever buy dog food from a store that sells only pet supplies, or did you never do that?

- Did that
- Never did that

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 0

BOOKS_INGRED. Did you ever read books, magazines, or information online to learn about what ingredients are in dog foods to decide which ones to buy, or did you never do that?

- Did that
- Never did that

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1

FOOD_ALLNATURAL. If you were to buy dog food, when deciding which food to buy, how much attention would you pay to whether the food is **all-natural**? A great deal of attention, a lot of attention, a moderate amount of attention, a little attention, or none at all?

- A great deal
- A lot
- A moderate amount
- A little

- None at all

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1

FOOD_GRAINFREE. If you were to buy dog food, when deciding which food to buy, how much attention would you pay to whether the food is **grain free**? A great deal of attention, a lot of attention, a moderate amount of attention, a little attention, or none at all?

- A great deal
- A lot
- A moderate amount
- A little
- None at all

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1

FOOD_ORGANIC. If you were to buy dog food, when deciding which food to buy, how much attention would you pay to whether the food is **organic**? A great deal of attention, a lot of attention, a moderate amount of attention, a little attention, or none at all?

- A great deal
- A lot
- A moderate amount
- A little
- None at all

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1

FOOD_TASTE. If you were to buy dog food, when deciding which food to buy, how much attention would you pay to whether the food **tastes good to dogs**? A great deal of attention, a lot of attention, a moderate amount of attention, a little attention, or none at all?

- A great deal
- A lot
- A moderate amount
- A little
- None at all

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1

FOOD_HEALTH. If you were to buy dog food, when deciding which food to buy, how much attention would you pay to whether the food will **improve the health of dogs**? A great deal of attention, a lot of attention, a moderate amount of attention, a little attention, or none at all?

- A great deal
- A lot
- A moderate amount
- A little
- None at all

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1

FOOD_APPEARANCE. If you were to buy dog food, when deciding which food to buy, how much attention would you pay to whether the food will **improve the appearance of dogs**? A great deal of attention, a lot of attention, a moderate amount of attention, a little attention, or none at all?

- A great deal
- A lot
- A moderate amount
- A little
- None at all

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1

DOG_FOOD_COOK. Did you ever cook food that your dog ate, or did you never do that?

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1

DOGS_FOOD_COOK. Did you ever cook food that any of your dogs ate, or did you never do that?

- Did that
 - Never did that
-

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1

DOG_FOODSPEND. During the time when you have owned a dog, how much money did you spend for your dog's food per month, on average?

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1

DOGS_FOODSPEND. During the time when you have owned dogs, how much money did you spend for your dogs' food per month, on average?

Please round to the nearest dollar and type the amount in the box below.

ENTER NUMBER BETWEEN 0 AND 10000

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM>0

HARNESS. Did you ever put a dog in a harness, car seat, or crate when transporting it in a motor vehicle, or did you never do that?

- Did that
 - Never did that
-

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM>0

DONATE. Did you ever donate money to an animal shelter or animal rescue group, or did you never do that?

- Did that
 - Never did that
-

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1

DOG_UNDERSTAND. How well has your dog understood what you said to it? Extremely well, very well, moderately well, slightly well, or not well at all?

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1

DOGS_UNDERSTAND. How well have your dogs understood what you said to them? Extremely well, very well, moderately well, slightly well, or not well at all?

- Extremely well
 - Very well
 - Moderately well
 - Slightly well
 - Not well at all
-

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1

DOG_BIRTHDAY. Did you ever celebrate the birthday of your dog, or did you never do that?

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1

DOGS_BIRTHDAY. Did you ever celebrate the birthday of any of your dogs, or did you never do that?

- Did that
 - Never did that
-

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1

DOG_HOLIDAY. Did you ever give your dog a gift for a holiday other than a birthday, or did you never do that?

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1

DOGS_HOLIDAY. Did you ever give any of your dogs a gift for a holiday other than a birthday, or did you never do that?

- Did that
 - Never did that
-

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1

DOG_TRAINER. Did you ever pay for obedience training for your dog, or did you never do that?

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM >1

DOGS_TRAINER. Did you ever pay for obedience training for any of your dogs, or did you never do that?

- Did that
 - Never did that
-

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 0

INSURANCE. Did you ever buy health insurance for a dog, or did you never do that?

- Did that
 - Never did that
-

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1

DOG_ANNOY. How often has your dog done things that annoyed you? Extremely often, very often, moderately often, slightly often, or not often at all?

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1

DOGS_ANNOY. How often have your dogs done things that annoyed you? Extremely often, very often, moderately often, slightly often, or not often at all?

- Extremely often
 - Very often
 - Moderately often
 - Slightly often
 - Not often at all
-

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 0

VIDEO. Did you ever watch a television program or video featuring a dog expert or animal trainer, or did you never do that?

- Did that
 - Never did that
-

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 0

BOOKS_TRAINER. Did you ever read a book or article by a dog expert or animal trainer, or did you never do that?

- Did that
 - Never did that
-

Now we'd like to ask some questions about you.

P_30EXERCISE. How many times per week, on average, do you get 30 or more minutes of exercise?

RECORD NUMBER FROM 0 – 40

P_DIET. During the last month, how healthy was the food you ate? Extremely healthy, very healthy, moderately healthy, slightly healthy, or not healthy at all?

- Extremely healthy
 - Very healthy
 - Moderately healthy
 - Slightly healthy
 - Not healthy at all
-

P_SHOP_ORGANIC. When you shopped for groceries during the last month, did you ever buy **organic** products, or did you not do that?

- Did that
 - Did not do that
-

P_SHOP_NONGMO. When you shopped for groceries during the last month, do you ever buy **non-GMO** products, or do you not do that?

- Did that
- Did not do that

P_SHOP_LOCAL. When you shopped for groceries during the last month, did you ever buy products that were **grown locally** or did you not do that?

- Did that
- Did not do that

DEMO_INST: The last few questions are for statistical purposes. You may have answered similar questions like this in the past. We appreciate your patience in answering them now.

SEX. What is your sex?

1. Male
2. Female

MARITAL. Are you now married, widowed, divorced, separated, or never married?

1. Married
2. Widowed
3. Divorced
4. Separated
5. Never married

QINCOME1. The next question is about your family income. This includes income from jobs, pensions, social security, interest, child support, dividends, profits from businesses or farms, or any other sources of income.

If you live alone, your family income is just your total income. If you live with other family members, your family income includes your total income plus the incomes of any of the family members who live with you.

During 2018, what was your total family income, before taxes?

Type in the number for the answer

\$_____

DISPLAY IF QINCOME1 is answered

QINCOME1_CHECK. Just to be sure our computer is recording your answer correctly, did you mean to type that your total family income in 2018 before taxes was [INSERT THE AMOUNT LISTED IN QINCOME1], or was it a different number?

Select one answer only

1. Yes, I meant to type that number.
 2. No, I meant to type a different number. [RETURN TO QINCOME1]
-

DISPLAY IF QINCOME1 is NOT answered, or QINCOME2 is asked, but NOT answered

QINCOME2A. Was it \$40,000 or more in 2018?

Select one answer only

1. \$40,000 or more
 2. Less than \$40,000 [SKIP TO INCOME2G]
-

DISPLAY IF QINCOME2A = 1

QINCOME2B. Was it \$50,000 or more?

Select one answer only

1. \$50,000 or more
 2. Less than \$50,000 [SKIP TO THANK]
-

DISPLAY IF QINCOME2B = 1

QINCOME2C. Was it \$60,000 or more?

Select one answer only

1. \$60,000 or more
 2. Less than \$60,000 [SKIP TO THANK]
-

DISPLAY IF QINCOME2C = 1

QINCOME2D. Was it \$75,000 or more?

Select one answer only

1. \$75,000 or more
 2. Less than \$75,000 [SKIP TO THANK]
-

DISPLAY IF QINCOME2D = 1

QINCOME2E. Was it \$100,000 or more?

Select one answer only

1. \$100,000 or more
 2. Less than \$100,000 [SKIP TO THANK]
-

DISPLAY IF QINCOME2E = 1

QINCOME2F. Was it \$150,000 or more?

Select one answer only

1. \$150,000 or more [SKIP TO THANK]
 2. Less than \$150,000 [SKIP TO THANK]
-

DISPLAY IF QINCOME2A = 2

QINCOME2G. Was it \$5,000 or more?

Select one answer only

1. \$5,000 or more
 2. Less than \$5,000 [SKIP TO THANK]
-

DISPLAY IF QINCOME2G = 1

QINCOME2H. Was it \$10,000 or more?

Select one answer only

1. \$10,000 or more
 2. Less than \$10,000 [SKIP TO THANK]
-

DISPLAY IF QINCOME2H = 1

QINCOME2I. Was it \$15,000 or more?

Select one answer only

1. \$15,000 or more
 2. Less than \$15,000 [SKIP TO THANK]
-

DISPLAY IF QINCOME2I = 1

QINCOME2J. Was it \$20,000 or more?

Select one answer only

1. \$20,000 or more
 2. Less than \$20,000 [SKIP TO THANK]
-

DISPLAY IF QINCOME2J = 1

QINCOME2K. Was it \$25,000 or more?

Select one answer only

1. \$25,000 or more
 2. Less than \$25,000 [SKIP TO THANK]
-

QINCOME2L. Was it \$30,000 or more?

Select one answer only

1. \$30,000 or more
2. Less than \$30,000

THANK. Thank you for answering these questions today. Please click the blue button to return to the AmeriSpeak website to submit your answers.

Please do not close your browser until you return to the AmeriSpeak website.

CHANGE "SUBMIT" BUTTON TEXT TO SAY "NEXT"

REDIRECT. Please wait while we connect you to the AmeriSpeak website. Do NOT close your browser until you have read the information on the next screen.

AUTO-REDIRECT TO NORC LIVE URL

ABOVE MESSAGE WILL ONLY BE VIEWABLE WHILE THE REDIRECT OCCURS. IF THERE IS NO LAG, THE RESPONDENT WILL JUST SEE THE AMERISPEAK WEBSITE SCREEN.

INTRO1.

Thank you for participating in this research.

Please complete this questionnaire all at one time without taking a break - it should take you about 25 minutes.

After you answer each question, you can move on to the next question by clicking the blue button at the bottom the screen.

Next

INTRO2.

Please do not click your browser's forward or back button. If you do, you will have to start the questionnaire again from the beginning.

Next

DOG_EVER.

To begin, have you ever owned a dog, or have you never owned a dog?

- ☐ Have owned a dog
- ☐ Have never owned a dog

Next

PRODUCT_INSTRUCTION.

On the next screens, you will see pictures of a dog food sold in the U.S.

Please look at each picture carefully. After you have finished looking at each picture, please click the blue button to move to the next screen.

Next

DISPLAY IF fc = 1

This is the front of the bag



Next

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

This is a close-up of the top part of the front of the bag



Next

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

This is a close-up of the middle part of the front of the bag



Next

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

This is a close-up of the bottom part of the front of the bag



Next

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

On the next few screens, you will see the words that are printed on the front of the bag you just saw. Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

Next

DISPLAY IF $f_c = 1$

EASY OPEN LIFT AND PULL TAB TO YOUR RIGHT

DO NOT CUT

Orijen NOURISH AS NATURE INTENDED

NEW ENGLAND'S VAST ATLANTIC WATERS-OUR SOURCE OF INSPIRATION AND FRESH REGIONAL FISH

WHOLEPREY™ DIET

FISH | ORGANS | CARTILAGE

85% WILD-CAUGHT FISH INGREDIENTS

15% VEGETABLES | FRUITS | BOTANICALS + ZINC OUR ONLY SUPPLEMENT

0% GRAIN | POTATO | TAPIOCA | PLANT PROTEIN CONCENTRATES

FRESH, RAW OR DEHYDRATED FISH INGREDIENTS | NO RENDERED FISH, POULTRY OR MEAT MEALS

Six Fish

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ DOG FOOD

MADE WITH SIX WILD AND SUSTAINABLY CAUGHT FISH DELIVERED DAILY

NEW ENGLAND HERRING, FLOUNDER, MACKEREL, REDFISH, MONKFISH AND ALASKAN COD

BA

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™

PROTEIN-RICH | CARBOHYDRATE-LIMITED*

RF

NO RENDERED MEALS

NO RENDERED FISH MEAL

Next

DISPLAY IF $f_c = 1$

6 FRESH OR RAW

TOP 6 FRESH OR RAW

WILD AND SUSTAINABLY CAUGHT

WHOLEPREY™ DIET

FISH | ORGANS | CARTILAGE

FD

FREEZE-DRIED LIVER

INFUSED FOR NATURAL FLAVOR

MADE IN OUR USA KENTUCKY KITCHENS | PREPARED WITH PRIDE FROM TRUSTED REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

*MAXIMUM 20% CARBOHYDRATE (AS ESTIMATED BY NFE)

Orijen

NOURISH AS NATURE INTENDED

Six Fish

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ DOG FOOD

NET WEIGHT 13 LB | 5.9 KG

WHOLEPREY™ DIET | 85 15 0

DOG FOOD

FOR ALL BREEDS AND LIFE STAGES

Next

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$



AMERICAN HUMANE SOCIETY'S "ETHICALLY APPROPRIATE" LISTING

2014
BEST
PET FOOD

2015
BEST
PET FOOD

2015
BEST
PET FOOD

2015
BEST
PET FOOD

2015
BEST
PET FOOD

2015
BEST
PET FOOD

TRUSTED EVERYWHERE.

SELECTED BY PET LOVERS EVERYWHERE, ORIJEN IS THE FULLEST EXPRESSION OF OUR ETHICALLY APPROPRIATE™ AND FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS COMMITMENT.

ORIJEN SIX FISH is born from the passionate inclusion of wild-caught New England fish, sustainably harvested by people we know and trust, and delivered only — WHOLELY, FRESH or RAW — and preserved without preservatives, artificial preservatives, or additives.

Prepared exclusively in our Kentucky Dogfish™ kitchens, award-winning ORIJEN is guaranteed to keep your cherished family healthy, happy, and thriving.



ETHICALLY APPROPRIATE™
ORIJEN is a pet food company that respects the rights of animals and the environment. We are committed to ethical sourcing and humane treatment of animals.



100% FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS
ORIJEN is a pet food company that respects the rights of animals and the environment. We are committed to ethical sourcing and humane treatment of animals.



KENTUCKY DOGFISH™
ORIJEN is a pet food company that respects the rights of animals and the environment. We are committed to ethical sourcing and humane treatment of animals.



OUR DOGFISH KITCHENS

PREPARED IN THE
KENTUCKY DOGFISH™ KITCHENS

PEOPLE WE TRUST

RESPECTED BY THE
NEW YORK TIMES, USA TODAY, AND MORE

FRESH AND REGIONAL

PREPARED IN THE
KENTUCKY DOGFISH™ KITCHENS

ORIJEN SIX FISH

ORIJEN SIX FISH is a pet food company that respects the rights of animals and the environment. We are committed to ethical sourcing and humane treatment of animals.

ORIJEN SIX FISH is a pet food company that respects the rights of animals and the environment. We are committed to ethical sourcing and humane treatment of animals.

ORIJEN SIX FISH is a pet food company that respects the rights of animals and the environment. We are committed to ethical sourcing and humane treatment of animals.

THIS IS OUR PROMISE OF FRESH, RAW OR DEHYDRATED FISH INGREDIENTS.

11LB* OF FRESH, RAW OR DEHYDRATED FISH INGREDIENTS. *ETHICALLY APPROPRIATE.



SALM

100% SALMON



TROUT

100% TROUT



PIKE

100% PIKE



SALM

100% SALMON



TROUT

100% TROUT



PIKE

100% PIKE

WHOLEPREY™ DIET

100% WHOLEPREY DIET

ORIJEN SIX FISH is a pet food company that respects the rights of animals and the environment. We are committed to ethical sourcing and humane treatment of animals.

NO RENDERED FISH MEALS

ORIJEN SIX FISH is a pet food company that respects the rights of animals and the environment. We are committed to ethical sourcing and humane treatment of animals.

ETHICALLY APPROPRIATE™

ORIJEN SIX FISH is a pet food company that respects the rights of animals and the environment. We are committed to ethical sourcing and humane treatment of animals.

ORIJEN SIX FISH

ORIJEN SIX FISH is a pet food company that respects the rights of animals and the environment. We are committed to ethical sourcing and humane treatment of animals.

ETHICALLY APPROPRIATE™

ORIJEN SIX FISH is a pet food company that respects the rights of animals and the environment. We are committed to ethical sourcing and humane treatment of animals.

DISPLAY IF $f_c = 1$




AWARD-WINNING BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ DOG FOOD

2014

AMERICAN PET FOOD FEDERATION

2015

AMERICAN PET FOOD FEDERATION

2015

THE DOG CHAMPION

2015

THE DOG CHAMPION

2015

THE DOG CHAMPION

2015-2016

THE DOG CHAMPION

TRUSTED EVERYWHERE.

TRUSTED BY PET LOVERS EVERYWHERE, ORIGEN IS THE PULSING EXPRESSION OF OUR BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ AND FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS COMMITMENT.

ORIGEN SIX FISH IS PRIMARILY WITH UNMATCHED INCLUSIONS OF WILD-CAUGHT NEW ENGLAND FISH SUSTAINABLY HARVESTED BY PEOPLE WE KNOW AND TRUST, AND DELIVERED DAILY — WHOLE, FRESH or RAW, and preservative-free, so they're bursting with goodness and taste.

Prepared exclusively in our Kentucky DogStar® kitchens, award-winning ORIGEN is guaranteed to keep your cherished dog healthy, happy and strong.



Dr. Mark S. Hill
Founder



BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™

ORIGEN IS A PET-FRIENDLY, NUTRITIONALLY BALANCED, AND SUSTAINABLE DOG FOOD. IT'S THE ONLY DOG FOOD THAT'S BOTH WHOLE AND FRESH.



FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

ORIGEN IS A PET-FRIENDLY, NUTRITIONALLY BALANCED, AND SUSTAINABLE DOG FOOD. IT'S THE ONLY DOG FOOD THAT'S BOTH WHOLE AND FRESH.



NEVER WITHHOLDEN

ORIGEN IS A PET-FRIENDLY, NUTRITIONALLY BALANCED, AND SUSTAINABLE DOG FOOD. IT'S THE ONLY DOG FOOD THAT'S BOTH WHOLE AND FRESH.

DISPLAY IF $f_c = 1$

PEOPLE WE TRUST

INCREASINGLY WE LOVE
FROM PEOPLE, WEIGHING AND TRUST

ABOUT 1 MILLION POUNDS OF FRESH FISH, TRUCKS DELIVER THEM TO OUR STORES

OUR DOGSTAR KITCHENS

DOGS CAN ONLY TASTE FRESH, PEOPLE CAN ONLY TRUST US

FRESH AND REGIONAL

QUALIFIED ONLY
THE DOGSTAR

AWARD-WINNING ETHICALLY APPROPRIATE™ FACTORY

ORIJEN SIX FISH

HOOKED ON THE REAL AND RAW, AND THE BRAND'S STORY, POSSESSING A BIOLOGICAL NEED FOR A DIET THAT'S FISH AND VARIED IN HOUSEHOLD ANIMAL PROTEIN.

That's why we loaded ORIJEN SIX FISH with an unmatched abundance of wild-caught fish — whisked to our kitchens from cold New England waters FRESH or RAW, in richly nourishing WholePrey™ ratios.

Biologically Appropriate™ ORIJEN keeps your dog happy and strong. Read our ingredients and you'll be happy too!

INGREDIENTS:

Whole Atlantic herring, yellowfin flounder, whole Atlantic croaker, whole Atlantic redfish, Atlantic menhaden, Atlantic cod, dehydrated yellowfin flounder, dehydrated Atlantic cod, dehydrated Atlantic herring, dehydrated Atlantic croaker, dehydrated Atlantic redfish, dehydrated Atlantic salmon, salmon oil, whole green peas, whole tiny lentils, red lentils, herring oil, green lentils, chickpeas, green lentils, alfalfa, natural fish flavor, flaxseed oil, dried kelp, freeze-dried cod liver, whole pumpkin, whole butternut squash, kale, spinach, mustard greens, collard greens, romaine lettuce, whole carrots, organic green papaya seeds, watermelon seeds, pea protein isolate, dried kelp extract (green/white), thyme root, turmeric, sardine oil (not added), whole rice, rosemary, papaya berries, dried botanicals and botanicals, fermented product, dried botanicals, seaweed fermentation product, dried botanicals, seaweed fermentation product, dried botanicals, seaweed fermentation product.

GUARANTEED ANALYSIS:

Crude protein (min.)	28.5%
Crude fat (min.)	13.5%
Crude fiber (max.)	4.5%

$$\text{DISPLAY IF } f_c = 1$$

[illegible]

DISPLAY IF $f_c = 1$

Next

DISPLAY IF $f_c = 1$

Orijen

NOURISH AS NATURE INTENDED

AWARD-WINNING BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ DOG FOOD 2014

LEADERSHIP AWARDS "FOOD INNOVATION" 2015

ALBERTA AWARD OF DISTINCTION 2015

ALBERTA EXPORT AWARD FOR CONSUMER PRODUCTS 2015

TOP 10 BEST DOG FOOD BRANDS REVIEWS.COM 2015

INNOVATION AWARD PETFOOD & ANIMAL NUTRITION 2.0 2015-2016

EXCELLENCE IN CANINE PET FOOD

GLYCEMIC RESEARCH INSTITUTE WASHINGTON DC

TRUSTED EVERYWHERE.

TRUSTED BY PET LOVERS EVERYWHERE, ORIJEN IS THE FULLEST EXPRESSION OF OUR BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ AND FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS COMMITMENT.

Orijen Six Fish is brimming with unmatched inclusions of wild-caught New England fish, sustainably harvested by people we know and trust, and delivered daily-WHOLE, FRESH or RAW, and preservative-free, so they're bursting with goodness and taste.

Prepared exclusively in our Kentucky DogStar® kitchens, award-winning ORIJEN is guaranteed to keep your cherished dog healthy, happy and strong.

Reinhard Muihlenfeld

Founder

Next

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™

NOURISH AS NATURE INTENDED-Orijen mirrors the richness, freshness and variety of WholePrey™ meats that dogs are evolved to eat.

FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

GROWN CLOSE TO HOME-We focus on local ingredients that are ethically raised by people we know and trust, and delivered to our kitchens fresh or raw each day.

NEVER OUTSOURCED

PREPARED EXCLUSIVELY IN OUR DOGSTAR® KITCHENS-We don't make foods for other companies and we don't allow our foods to be made by anyone else.

PEOPLE WE TRUST

INGREDIENTS WE LOVE FROM PEOPLE WE KNOW AND TRUST

EOIN OF NORPEL FISHERIES IN NEW ENGLAND. TRUSTED SUPPLIER OF FRESH REGIONAL FISH.

OUR DOGSTAR® KITCHENS

AWARD-WINNING FOODS

AWARD-WINNING KITCHENS

ANNA, JEFF AND OUR 25,000 SQUARE FOOT COOLER, OUR KENTUCKY DOGSTAR® KITCHENS.

FRESH AND REGIONAL

DELIVERED DAILY FRESH OR RAW

WILD-CAUGHT NEW ENGLAND FISH, DELIVERED FRESH OR RAW DAILY.

Next

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

THIS 13 LB PACKAGE OF ORIJEN IS MADE WITH OVER 11 LB* OF FRESH, RAW OR DEHYDRATED FISH INGREDIENTS *APPROXIMATE INCLUSIONS.

2/3 FRESH OR RAW, 1/3 DRIED OR OILS.

5 LB* FRESH, RAW OR DRIED WILD ATLANTIC HERRING

1 2/3 LB* FRESH, RAW OR DRIED WILD YELLOW TAIL FLOUNDER

1 1/3 LB* FRESH, RAW OR DRIED WILD ATLANTIC MACKEREL

2/3 LB* FRESH OR RAW WILD ACADIAN RED FISH

2/3 LB* FRESH OR RAW WILD MONKFISH

2/3 LB* FRESH OR RAW WILD ALASKAN COD

+ PLUS 1 1/4 LB* DEHYDRATED ANCHOVY, SARDINE AND SALMON +

WHOLEPREY™ DIET

FISH | ORGANS | CARTILAGE

IN HER INFINITE WISDOM, MOTHER NATURE MATCHED THE NUTRIENTS IN WHOLE PREY ANIMALS TO PERFECTLY MEET YOUR DOG'S DIETARY NEEDS.

That's why ORIJEN features richly nourishing whole fish that provide a concentrated source of virtually every nutrient your dog needs to thrive, naturally, without long lists of synthetic supplements-only zinc is added.

Next

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

RF

NO RENDERED FISH MEALS

MADE WITH FRESH, RAW OR DEHYDRATED FISH INGREDIENTS

RENDERED FISH MEALS ARE PROCESSED AT HIGH TEMPERATURES, TYPICALLY FROM INGREDIENTS UNFIT FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION.

Orijen features FRESH, RAW OR DEHYDRATED fish ingredients, minimally processed at lower temperatures from wild-caught fish that are deemed fit for human consumption prior to inclusion in our foods.

MADE IN OUR USA KENTUCKY KITCHENS

AWARD-WINNING BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ DOG FOOD

Orijen Six Fish

MODERN DOGS ARE BUILT JUST LIKE THEIR ANCESTORS, POSSESSING A BIOLOGICAL NEED FOR A DIET THAT'S RICH AND VARIED IN NOURISHING ANIMAL PROTEIN.

That's why we loaded ORIJEN SIX FISH with unmatched inclusions of wild-caught fish-whisked to our kitchens from cold New England waters FRESH or RAW, in richly nourishing WholePrey™ ratios.

Biologically Appropriate™ ORIJEN keeps your dog happy and strong. Read our ingredients and you'll be happy too!

Next

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

INGREDIENTS

Whole atlantic herring, yellowtail flounder, whole atlantic mackerel, whole acadian redfish, atlantic monkfish, alaskan cod, dehydrated yellowtail flounder, dehydrated anchovy, dehydrated atlantic herring, dehydrated atlantic mackerel, dehydrated sardine, dehydrated atlantic salmon, sunflower oil, whole green peas, whole navy beans, red lentils, herring oil, pinto beans, chickpeas, green lentils, alfalfa, natural fish flavor, safflower oil, dried kelp, freeze-dried cod liver, whole pumpkin, whole butternut squash, kale, spinach, mustard greens, collard greens, turnip greens, whole carrots, apples, pears, pumpkin seeds, sunflower seeds, zinc proteinate, mixed tocopherols (preservative), chicory root, turmeric, sarsaparilla root, althea root, rosehips, juniper berries, dried lactobacillus acidophilus fermentation product, dried bifidobacterium animalis fermentation product, dried lactobacillus casei fermentation product.

GUARANTEED ANALYSIS

Crude protein (min.)	38%
Crude fat (min.)	18%
Crude fiber (max.)	4%
Moisture (max.)	12%
Calcium (min.)	1%
Phosphorus (min.)	0.9%
Omega-6 fatty acids* (min.)	2.2%
Omega-3 fatty acids* (min.)	2%
DHA* (docosahexaenoic acid) (min.)	0.6%
EPA* (eicosapentaenoic acid) (min.)	0.6%
Glucosamine* (min.)	800 mg/kg
Chondroitin sulfate* (min.)	600 mg/kg

*not recognized as an essential nutrient by the AAFCO Dog Food Nutrient Profiles

Next

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

CALORIE CONTENT

Calorie content (calculated): ME 3940 kcal/kg. 449 kcal per 8 oz. cup.

Calories distributed to support peak conditioning with 39% from protein, 20% from vegetables and fruits, and 41% from fat.

ORIEN SIX FISH DOG FOOD IS FORMULATED TO MEET THE NUTRITIONAL LEVELS ESTABLISHED BY THE AAFCO DOG FOOD NUTRIENT PROFILES FOR ALL LIFE STAGES.

Champion Petfoods® World's Best Petfood

MADE BY CHAMPION PETFOODS USA INC.

12871 BOWLING GREEN ROAD

AUBURN, KENTUCKY 42206

DOGSTAR® KITCHENS

CHAMPIONPETFOODS.COM

EU REG.

CUSTOMER CARE [USA]

TOLL FREE 1.877.939.0006

FOLLOW US ONLINE

@ORIENPETFOOD

@CHAMPIONPETFOOD

ORIEN SIX FISH FOR DOGS

13LB | 5.9KG

ORIEN.CA

Next

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

This is one side of the bag



Next

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

On the next screen, you will see the words that are printed on one side of the bag you saw earlier. Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

Next

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

MADE IN OUR USA KENTUCKY KITCHENS

DAILY RATION AND FEEDING GUIDE

8 OZ CUP IS 114G OF FOOD

DOG WEIGHT		LESS ACTIVE 1 hour or LESS daily exercise		ACTIVE 1 hour or MORE daily exercise	
LB	KG	CUPS/DAY	GR/DAY	CUPS/DAY	GR/DAY
4 1/2 lb	2 kg	1/4 c	28 g	1/3 c	38 g
11 lb	5 kg	1/2 c	57 g	3/4 c	86 g
22 lb	10 kg	3/4 c	86 g	1 1/3 c	152 g
44 lb	20 kg	1 1/2 c	171 g	2 3/4 c	257 g
66 lb	30 kg	2 c	228 g	3 c	342 g
88 lb	40 kg	2 1/2 c	285 g	3 3/4 c	428 g
110 lb	50 kg	3 c	342 g	4 1/2 c	513 g
132 lb	60 kg	3 1/3 c	380 g	5 c	570 g

EVERY DOG IS DIFFERENT.

Just like you, your dog is a unique individual with feeding requirements that will vary with environment, age and activity.

This chart provides an initial guide, and we suggest monitoring your dog's weight and adjusting amounts as needed. Feed twice daily, and always keep fresh, clean water available.

PUPPIES: at 1 1/2-3 months old feed twice the adult amount. At 3-6 months feed 1 1/2 times the adult amount. At 6-11 months feed 1 1/4 times the adult amount.

GESTATION: increase from 25% to 50% of the adult amount. LACTATION: feed 'free choice'.

ORJEN SIX FISH DOG FOOD is formulated to meet the nutritional levels established by the AAFCO Dog Food Nutrient Profiles for all life stages.

Next

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

This is the other side of the bag



Next

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

On the next screen, you will see the words that are printed on the other side of the bag you saw earlier. Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

Next

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

Six Fish

WHOLEPREY™ DIET | 85 15 0

MADE IN OUR USA KENTUCKY KITCHENS

Next

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

This is the front of the bag



Next

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$


This is a close-up of the top part of the front of the bag



Next

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

This is a close-up of the middle part of the front of the bag



Next

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

This is a close-up of the bottom part of the front of the bag



Next

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

On the next few screens, you will see the words that are printed on the front of the bag you just saw. Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

Next

DISPLAY IF FC = 2

EASY OPEN

LIFT AND PULL TAB TO YOUR RIGHT

DO NOT CUT

UNMATCHED REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

FRESH OR RAW

SINGLE ANIMAL PROTEIN from FREE-RUN MUSCOVY DUCK

MUSCOVY DUCK Christian County, Kentucky

BARTLETT PEAR Louisville, Kentucky

SARSAPARILLA Hart County, Kentucky

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ RATIOS

50% FREE-RUN DUCK INGREDIENTS

INCLUDING DUCK, LIVER, GIBLETS AND CARTILAGE

50% VEGETABLES, FRUITS & BOTANICALS

PLUS ZINC PROTEINATE-OUR ONE AND ONLY SUPPLEMENT

0% NO GRAIN, POTATO, TAPIOCA

GLUTENS OR ANY OTHER PLANT PROTEIN CONCENTRATES

1

Next

DISPLAY IF fc = 2

WHOLEPREY™ SINGLE

DUCK | ORGANS | CARTILAGE

ACANA®

SINGLES

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ | SINGLE ANIMAL PROTEIN

DUCK & PEAR SINGLES FORMULA

with FREE-RUN MUSCOVY DUCK & FRESH BARTLETT PEARS

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ | SINGLE ANIMAL PROTEIN

BA

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™

PROTEIN RICH, CARBOHYDRATE LIMITED*

1

WHOLEPREY™ SINGLE

FLESH, LIVER & CARTILAGE FROM DUCK

1

Next

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

FIRST INGREDIENT

FROM FRESH OR RAW MUSCOVY DUCK

FD

HIGH PALATABILITY

INFUSED WITH FREEZE-DRIED DUCK LIVER

FRESH AND LOCAL

KENTUCKY GROWN VEGETABLES, FRUITS AND BOTANICALS

*MAXIMUM 30% CARBOHYDRATE (AS ESTIMATED BY NFE)

COMPLETE FOOD FOR DOGS

ALL BREEDS | ALL LIFE STAGES

NET WEIGHT

13 LB | 5.9 KG

KENTUCKY'S FERTILE FARMS AND ORCHARDS

OUR SOURCE OF INSPIRATION AND FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

MADE IN OUR USA KENTUCKY KITCHENS

PREPARED WITH PRIDE FROM TRUSTED REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

ACANA®

SINGLES

DUCK & PEAR SINGLES FORMULA

with FREE-RUN MUSCOVY DUCK & FRESH BARTLETT PEARS

COMPLETE FOOD FOR DOGS

ALL BREEDS | ALL LIFE STAGES

Next

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

This is the back of the bag

ACANA

OUR MISSION IS CLEAR AND STRONG.

At Champion, we've been making **BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™** dog foods from **FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS** since 1985.

Our **ACANA Single's** and **WholePrey™ Single's** are made with **fresh, regional ingredients** from **local sources** in **North America**. We're proud to be a **family-owned business** that's been **feeding dogs** for **over 30 years**. We're proud to be a **family-owned business** that's been **feeding dogs** for **over 30 years**.

ACANA Family-Owned Business

VEGETABLE GRAFTING
Vegetable grafting is a technique used to join two different plant varieties together to create a new plant with the best of both worlds.

VEGETABLE GRAFTING
Vegetable grafting is a technique used to join two different plant varieties together to create a new plant with the best of both worlds.

VEGETABLE GRAFTING
Vegetable grafting is a technique used to join two different plant varieties together to create a new plant with the best of both worlds.

SINGLES
A single source of animal protein from which all other ingredients are derived.

**INGREDIENTS WE LOVE
PEOPLE WE TRUST**

ACANA's ingredients are sourced from the best regional sources possible. We're proud to be a family-owned business that's been feeding dogs for over 30 years. We're proud to be a family-owned business that's been feeding dogs for over 30 years.

ACANA's ingredients are sourced from the best regional sources possible. We're proud to be a family-owned business that's been feeding dogs for over 30 years. We're proud to be a family-owned business that's been feeding dogs for over 30 years.

**UNMATCHED REGIONAL INGREDIENTS
DELIVERED FRESH**

**DUCK & PEAR
SINGLES FORMULA**

ALL OTHER FORMULAS ARE DERIVED FROM A SINGLE SOURCE. THAT'S WHY ACANA'S FORMULA IS **UNMATCHED REGIONAL INGREDIENTS DELIVERED FRESH**. We're proud to be a family-owned business that's been feeding dogs for over 30 years. We're proud to be a family-owned business that's been feeding dogs for over 30 years.

WHOLEPREY™ SINGLES

WHOLEPREY™ SINGLES are made from **whole prey** animals. We're proud to be a family-owned business that's been feeding dogs for over 30 years. We're proud to be a family-owned business that's been feeding dogs for over 30 years.

**OUR INGREDIENTS
OUR HISTORY**

ACANA's ingredients are sourced from the best regional sources possible. We're proud to be a family-owned business that's been feeding dogs for over 30 years. We're proud to be a family-owned business that's been feeding dogs for over 30 years.

Next

ACANA

OUR MISSION IS CLEAR AND STRONG.

At Champion, we've been making **BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™** dog foods from **FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS** since 1985.

Our **ACANA SKILLES** are Biologically Appropriate™ and Limited Ingredient foods, featuring a single source of animal protein from ranch-raised lamb, free-run duck, yorkshire pork or wild-caught mackerel — all farmed, raised or fished by people we trust and delivered to our kitchens **FRESH** or **RAW**, so they're bursting with goodness and taste.

David M. Arnold
Founder

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™

Our foods mirror the natural, balanced, and varied diets of wild animals for which dogs are evolved to eat.

FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

We source our fresh ingredients from our regions that are certified, raised or fished by people we know and trust.

NEVER RECYCLED

We prepare our **ACANA FRESH** in our own kitchens, so it's 100% TASTE. Fresh for every dog.

SINGLES

DOG FOODS

INGREDIENTS WE LOVE PEOPLE WE TRUST

FOOD CHOICES ARE SOME OF OUR MOST IMPORTANT DECISIONS AND THESE DAYS, KNOWING WHERE YOUR FOOD IS FRESH HAS TAKEN ON NEW IMPORTANCE.

That's why we make **ACANA** in our own kitchens, from fresh, regional ingredients raised by people we know and trust, like the Bosher and Sons of Hower Farms in Paducah, Kentucky — trusted suppliers of fresh free-run Muscovy Ducks.

OUR BOY AND GIRL ARE JORDAN (LAMB) IN PADUCAH, KENTUCKY. TRUSTED SUPPLIERS OF FRESH FREE-RUN MUSCOVY DUCK.

Next

[illegible]

Next

DISPLAY IF $f_c = 2$

DISPLAY IF $f_c = 2$



News:

DISPLAY IF $f_c = 2$

ACANA®

OUR MISSION IS CLEAR AND STRONG.

At Champion, we've been making BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ dog foods from FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS since 1985.

Our ACANA SINGLES are Biologically Appropriate™ and Limited Ingredient foods, featuring a single source of animal protein from ranch-raised lamb, free-run duck, yorkshire pork or wild-caught mackerel—all farmed, fished or ranched by people we trust and delivered to our kitchens FRESH or RAW, so they're bursting with goodness and taste.

Reinhard Muhlenfeld

Founder

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™

Our foods mirror the richness, freshness and variety of meats for which DOGS ARE EVOLVED TO EAT.

FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

We focus on fresh ingredients from our region that are ranched, raised or fished by people we know and trust.

NEVER OUTSOURCED

We prepare our OWN FOODS in our OWN KITCHENS and we DON'T make foods for anyone else.

SINGLES

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ | SINGLE ANIMAL PROTEIN

INGREDIENTS WE LOVE

PEOPLE WE TRUST

FOOD CHOICES ARE SOME OF OUR MOST IMPORTANT DECISIONS AND THESE DAYS, KNOWING WHERE YOUR FOOD IS FROM HAS TAKEN ON NEW IMPORTANCE.

That's why we make ACANA in our own kitchens, from fresh, regional ingredients raised by people we know and trust, like Brandon and Amie of Hoover Farms in Pembroke, Kentucky—trusted suppliers of fresh free-run Muscovy duck.

Next

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

BRANDON AND AMIE OF HOOVER FARMS IN PEMBROKE, KENTUCKY. TRUSTED SUPPLIERS OF FRESH FREE-RUN MUSCOVY DUCK.

Made with UNMATCHED REGIONAL INGREDIENTS DELIVERED FRESH

DUCK & PEAR SINGLES FORMULA WITH FREE-RUN KENTUCKY DUCK & FRESH BARTLETT PEARS

COMPLETE FOOD FOR DOGS

ALL BREEDS | ALL LIFE STAGES

ALL DOGS EVOLVED AS CARNIVORES, BIOLOGICALLY ADAPTED TO A DIET RICH IN MEAT AND PROTEINS. THAT'S WHY ACANA DUCK & PEAR FORMULA IS LOADED WITH 50% DUCK INGREDIENTS TO NOURISH YOUR DOG ACCORDING TO HIS EVOLUTIONARY NEEDS WHILE LIMITING HIS EXPOSURE TO A SINGLE ANIMAL PROTEIN.

Raised free-run on local Kentucky farms, our fresh Muscovy duck arrives in WholePrey™ ratios—a richly nourishing ratio of duck, liver, gizzards and cartilage that deliver nutrients naturally, virtually eliminating the need for additives. Generous infusions of freeze-dried duck liver make this delicious food a perfect choice for fussy dogs.

Prepared in our Kentucky kitchens from fresh regional ingredients, this unique Biologically Appropriate™ and Limited Ingredient food is guaranteed to keep your cherished dog happy and strong. Read our ingredients and we think you'll agree!

Next

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

INGREDIENTS

Deboned duck, duck meal, whole green peas, red lentils, duck liver, duck fat, pinto beans, chickpeas, herring oil, green lentils, whole yellow peas, duck giblets (liver, heart, kidney), pears, sun-cured alfalfa, natural duck flavor, duck cartilage, dried kelp, freeze-dried duck liver, whole pumpkin, whole butternut squash, kale, spinach, mustard greens, collard greens, turnip greens, carrots, apples, pumpkin seeds, sunflower seeds, zinc proteinate, mixed tocopherols (preservative), chicory root, turmeric, sarsaparilla root, althea root, rosehips, juniper berries, dried lactobacillus acidophilus fermentation product, dried bifidobacterium animalis fermentation product, dried lactobacillus casei fermentation product.

CALORIE CONTENT (calculated): Metabolizable Energy is 3475 kcal/kg (396 kcal per standard 8 oz cup).

Calories are distributed to support peak conditioning with 27% from protein, 31% from fruits and vegetables, and 42% from fat.

GUARANTEED ANALYSIS

Crude protein (min.)	27%
Crude fat (min.)	17%
Crude fiber (max.)	6%
Moisture (max.)	12%
Calcium (min.)	1.1%
Phosphorus (min.)	0.8%
Omega-6* (min.)	2.2%
Omega-3* (min.)	0.8%
DHA* (docosahexaenoic acid) (min.)	0.15%
EPA* (eicosapentaenoic acid) (min.)	0.1%
Glucosamine* (min.)	1200 mg/kg
Chondroitin sulfate* (min.)	1000 mg/kg

*not recognized as an essential nutrient by the AAFCO Dog Food Nutrient Profiles

Next

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

DAILY RATION AND FEEDING GUIDE

8 OZ CUP IS 114G OF FOOD

DOG WEIGHT		LESS ACTIVE 1 hour or LESS daily exercise		ACTIVE 1 hour or MORE daily exercise	
LB	KG	CUPS/DAY	GR/DAY	CUPS/DAY	GR/DAY
4 lb	2 kg	1/3 c	38 g	1/2 c	57 g
11 lb	5 kg	2/3 c	76 g	1 c	114 g
22 lb	10 kg	1 c	114 g	1 1/2 c	171 g
44 lb	20 kg	1 2/3 c	190 g	2 1/2 c	285 g
66 lb	30 kg	2 1/3 c	266 g	3 1/2 c	399 g
88 lb	40 kg	3 c	342 g	4 1/4 c	485 g
110 lb	50 kg	3 1/3 c	380 g	5 c	570 g
132 lb	60 kg	4 c	456 g	5 3/4 c	656 g

EVERY DOG IS DIFFERENT. FEEDING AMOUNT WILL VARY WITH AGE AND ACTIVITY.

Use this chart as an initial guide and adjust amounts accordingly.

Feed twice daily and always provide fresh clean water.

PUPPIES: at 1 1/2-3 months old feed twice the adult amount, at 3-6 months feed 1 1/2 times the adult amount. At 6-11 months feed 1 1/4 times the adult amount.

GESTATION: increase from 25% to 50% of the adult amount.

LACTATION: feed 'free choice'.

ACANA DUCK & PEAR SINGLES FORMULA is formulated to meet the nutritional levels established by the AAFCO Dog Food Nutrient Profiles for All Life Stages.

THIS 13 LB PACKAGE OF ACANA IS MADE WITH 6 1/2 LBS FREE-RUN DUCK INGREDIENTS

3 1/4 LBS FRESH OR RAW

HALF IS FRESH or RAW and bursting with goodness and taste, and HALF IS DRIED or OILS to provide a strong and natural source of duck protein and fat.

Next

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

LIMITED INGREDIENTS SHOULDN'T MEAN LESS DUCK

†

WHOLEPREY™ SINGLES

DUCK | ORGAN | CARTILAGE

IN HER ETERNAL WISDOM, NATURE MATCHED THE NUTRIENTS FOUND IN WHOLE PREY ANIMALS TO PERFECTLY MEET THE NEEDS OF YOUR DOG.

Mirroring Mother Nature, ACANA WholePrey™ foods feature a richly nourishing balance of duck, organs and cartilage that reflect the whole prey animal, DELIVERING NUTRIENTS NATURALLY.

That's why you won't find long lists of additives in ACANA foods.

OUR INGREDIENTS.

OUR KITCHENS.

OUR FOOD.

TRUSTED EVERYWHERE.

SCOTTY AND ROBIN OF CEDAR VALLEY FARMS IN HODGENVILLE, KENTUCKY.

TRUSTED SUPPLIER OF FRESH WHOLE BUTTERNUT SQUASH.

Kentucky Proud

Champion PetFoods®

World's Best Petfood

MADE IN KENTUCKY BY CHAMPION PETFOODS USA INC.

12871 BOWLING GREEN ROAD, AUBURN, KENTUCKY 42206

EU REG.

CONSUMER CARE

TOLL FREE 1.877.939.0006

FOLLOW US ONLINE

@ACANAPETFOOD @CHAMPIONPETFOOD

DUCK & PEAR SINGLES FORMULA

13LB | 5.9KG

CHAMPIONPETFOODS.COM

Next

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

This is one side of the bag



Next

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

On the next screen, you will see the words that are printed on one side of the bag you saw earlier. Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

Next

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

UNMATCHED REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

FRESH OR RAW

SINGLE ANIMAL PROTEIN from FREE-RUN MUSCOVY DUCK

SINGLES

DUCK & PEAR SINGLES FORMULA

with FREE-RUN MUSCOVY DUCK & FRESH BARTLETT PEARS

COMPLETE FOOD FOR DOGS

ALL BREEDS | ALL LIFE STAGES

Next

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

This is the other side of the bag



Next

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

On the next screen, you will see the words that are printed on the other side of the bag you saw earlier. Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

Next

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

MADE IN USA

Made with unmatched REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

KENTUCKY KITCHENS

SINGLES

DUCK & PEAR SINGLES FORMULA

with FREE-RUN MUSCOVY DUCK & FRESH BARTLETT PEARS

COMPLETE FOOD FOR DOGS

ALL BREEDS | ALL LIFE STAGES

Next

NEXT, YOU WILL READ SOME INFORMATION ABOUT THE DOG FOOD THAT IS NOT ON THE PACKAGE.

Next

BEGIN CC BLOCK. RANDOMIZE ORDER OF PAGES IN THIS BLOCK.

DISPLAY PAGE IF $ccm = 1$

Laboratory testing has shown there is a risk that this food may contain mercury. The World Health Organization has said that in humans, "Mercury may have toxic effects on the nervous, digestive and immune systems, and on lungs, kidneys, skin and eyes."

Next

DISPLAY PAGE IF $ccc = 1$

Laboratory testing has shown there is a risk that this food may contain cadmium. A federal public health agency of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, has found, "Kidney and bone effects have also been observed in laboratory animals ingesting cadmium. Anemia, liver disease, and nerve or brain damage have been observed in animals eating or drinking cadmium."

Next

DISPLAY PAGE IF $ccl = 1$

Laboratory testing has shown there is a risk that this food may contain lead. The Food & Drug Administration has said, "Lead is poisonous to humans and can affect people of any age or health status."

Next

DISPLAY PAGE IF cca = 1

Laboratory testing has shown there is a risk that this food may contain arsenic. The Environmental Protection Agency has said, "Arsenic has been linked to a number of cancers. These include cancer of the bladder, lungs, skin, kidney, nasal passages, liver, and prostate."

Next

DISPLAY PAGE IF ccb = 1

Laboratory testing has shown there is a risk that this food may contain BPA. The Food & Drug Administration has said, "BPA is an industrial chemical used to make polycarbonate, a hard, clear plastic, which is used in many consumer products."

Next

DISPLAY PAGE IF ccf = 1

The manufacturer of this food has stated that it may include ingredients that are not delivered to them fresh but have been frozen before they are used to make the dog food.

Next

DISPLAY PAGE IF ccr = 1

The manufacturer of this food has stated that it may include ingredients that are sourced outside the region where it is manufactured. This may include not only other regions within the United States but also other regions internationally.

Next

DISPLAY PAGE IF cct = 1

The manufacturer of this food has stated that it uses third parties to process and manufacture protein meals and tallows used in its dog foods.

Next

END CC BLOCK

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1 & fc = 1 & PRICE = 1

fc1_pc1.

If you were buying dog food today, and the 13 pound bag of dog food you just saw is available at a price of \$47.99, would you buy it, or would you not buy it?

- ☐ Would buy it
☐ Would not buy it

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1 & fc = 2 & PRICE = 1

fc2_pc1.

If you were buying dog food today, and the 13 pound bag of dog food you just saw is available at a price of \$37.99, would you buy it, or would you not buy it?

- ☐ Would buy it
☐ Would not buy it

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1 & fc = 1 & PRICE = 2

fc1_pc2.

If you were buying dog food today, and the 13 pound bag of dog food you just saw is available at a price of \$50.99, would you buy it, or would you not buy it?

- ☐ Would buy it
☐ Would not buy it

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1 & fc = 2 & PRICE = 2

fc2_pc2.

If you were buying dog food today, and the 13 pound bag of dog food you just saw is available at a price of \$39.99, would you buy it, or would you not buy it?

- ☐ Would buy it
☐ Would not buy it

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1 & fc = 1 & PRICE = 3

fc1_pc3.

If you were buying dog food today, and the 13 pound bag of dog food you just saw is available at a price of \$53.49, would you buy it, or would you not buy it?

- ☐ Would buy it
☐ Would not buy it

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1 & fc = 2 & PRICE = 3

fc2_pc3.

If you were buying dog food today, and the 13 pound bag of dog food you just saw is available at a price of \$41.99, would you buy it, or would you not buy it?

- ☐ Would buy it
☐ Would not buy it

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1 & fc = 1 & PRICE = 4

fc1_pc4.

If you were buying dog food today, and the 13 pound bag of dog food you just saw is available at a price of \$55.99, would you buy it, or would you not buy it?

- ☐ Would buy it
☐ Would not buy it

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1 & fc = 2 & PRICE = 4

fc2_pc4.

If you were buying dog food today, and the 13 pound bag of dog food you just saw is available at a price of \$43.99, would you buy it, or would you not buy it?

- ☐ Would buy it
☐ Would not buy it

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1 & fc = 1 & PRICE = 5

fc1_pc5.

If you were buying dog food today, and the 13 pound bag of dog food you just saw is available at a price of \$58.99, would you buy it, or would you not buy it?

- ☐ Would buy it
- ☐ Would not buy it

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1 & fc = 2 & PRICE = 5

fc2_pc5.

If you were buying dog food today, and the 13 pound bag of dog food you just saw is available at a price of \$45.99, would you buy it, or would you not buy it?

- ☐ Would buy it
- ☐ Would not buy it

Next

QUALITY.

How would you rate the **quality** of this dog food? Excellent, good, fair, poor, or very poor?

- ☐ Excellent
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Fair
- ☐ Poor
- ☐ Very poor

Next

HEALTHY.

How **healthy** would you say this dog food is? Extremely healthy, very healthy, moderately healthy, slightly healthy, or not healthy at all?

- ☐ Extremely healthy
- ☐ Very healthy
- ☐ Moderately healthy
- ☐ Slightly healthy
- ☐ Not healthy at all

Next

FOOD_EVER.

Did you ever buy dog food, or did you never do that?

- ☐ Bought dog food
- ☐ Never bought dog food

Next

DISPLAY IF FOOD_EVER = 1

FOOD_CLASS.

Did you buy dog food after July 1, 2013, or did you not buy dog food then?

- ☐ Bought dog food after July 1, 2013
- ☐ Did not buy dog food after July 1, 2013

Next

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$ AND FOOD_EVER = 1

SPEC_BUY.

The dog food you looked at is called Orijen Six Fish.

Did you ever buy that type of dog food, or did you never buy it?

- ☐ Did buy it
- ☐ Did not buy it

Next

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$ AND $FOOD_EVER = 1$

SPEC_BUY.

The dog food you looked at is called Acana Duck and Pear Singles.

Did you ever buy that type of dog food, or did you never buy it?

- ☐ Did buy it
- ☐ Did not buy it

Next

DISPLAY IF $SPEC_BUY = 1$ & $FOOD_CLASS = 1$

SPEC_CLASS.

Did you buy this dog food after July 1, 2013, or did you NOT buy this dog food after that date?

- ☐ Did buy it after July 1, 2013
- ☐ Did not do that

Next

DISPLAY IF $FOOD_COND = 2$ & $FOOD_EVER = 1$ OR $FOOD_COND = 1$ & $SPEC_BUY = 2$

ORIJEN_BUY.

Did you ever buy dog food that had the word "Orijen" written on the package, or did you never do that?

- ☐ Did buy it
- ☐ Did not buy it

Next

DISPLAY IF ORIJEN_BUY = 1

Orijen_CLASS.

Did you ever buy dog food that had the word "Orijen" written on the package, or did you never do that?

- ☒ Did buy it
- ☐ Did not buy it

Did you buy dog food that had the word "Orijen" written on the package after July 1, 2013, or did you not do that?

- ☐ Did buy it after July 1, 2013
- ☐ Did not do that

Next

DISPLAY IF FOOD_COND = 1 & FOOD_EVER = 1 OR FOOD_COND = 2 & SPEC_PURCH = 2

ACANA_BUY.

Did you ever buy dog food that had the word "Acana" written on the package, or did you never do that?

- ☐ Did buy it
- ☐ Did not buy it

Next

DISPLAY IF ACANDA_PURCH = 1

ACANA_CLASS.

Did you buy dog food that had the word "Acana" written on the package after July 1, 2013, or did you not do that?

- ☐ Did buy it after July 1, 2013
- ☐ Did not do that

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1

DOG_NUM.

What is the total number of dogs you have owned since you were 18 years old?

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1

DOG_CURR.

Do you own that dog now, or do you not own it now?

- ☐ Own it now
- ☐ Do not own it now

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1

DOGS_CURR.

Do you own one of those dogs now, or do you not own any of those dogs now?

- ☐ Own one or more dogs now
- ☐ Do not own any dogs now

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_CURR = 2

DOG_CLASS.

Did you own that dog after July 1, 2013, or did you not own it then?

- ☐ Owned dog after July 1, 2013
- ☐ Did not own dog after July 1, 2013

Next

DISPLAY IF DOGS_CURR = 2

DOGS_CLASS.

Did you own any of those dogs after July 1, 2013, or did you not own any of them then?

- ☐ Owned one or more dogs after July 1, 2013
- ☐ Did not own any dogs after July 1, 2013

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1 & DOG_CURR = 1

WEIGHT 1A.

In the box below, please type how many pounds your dog has weighed, on average, during the time you have owned it.

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1 & DOG_CURR = 2

WEIGHT 1B.

In the box below, please type how many pounds your dog weighed, on average, during the time you owned it.

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1 AND DOG_NUM < 21

DOG_yWEIGHT_x. [SHOW NUMBER OF BOXES EQUAL TO DOG_NUM. x = TOTAL NUMBER OF DOGS; y = "INDEX" OF DOG, 1 THROUGH x]

In the boxes below, please type how many pounds each of your dogs weighed, on average, during the time you owned it.

Dog 1	<input type="text"/>
Dog 2	<input type="text"/>
Dog 3	<input type="text"/>
Dog 4	<input type="text"/>
Dog 5	<input type="text"/>
Dog 6	<input type="text"/>
Dog 7	<input type="text"/>
Dog 8	<input type="text"/>
Dog 9	<input type="text"/>
Dog 10	<input type="text"/>
Dog 11	<input type="text"/>
Dog 12	<input type="text"/>
Dog 13	<input type="text"/>
Dog 14	<input type="text"/>
Dog 15	<input type="text"/>
Dog 16	<input type="text"/>
Dog 17	<input type="text"/>
Dog 18	<input type="text"/>
Dog 19	<input type="text"/>
Dog 20	<input type="text"/>

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1 & DOG_CURR = 2

DOG_FRIEND_PAST.

Would you say your dog was your friend, or would you not say that?

- ☐ Would say that
- ☐ Would not say that

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1 & DOG_CURR = 1

DOG_FRIEND_PRES.

Would you say your dog is your friend, or would you not say that?

- ☐ Would say that
- ☐ Would not say that

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1

DOGS_FRIEND_PAST.

Would you say any of your dogs were your friend, or would you not say that?

- ☐ Would say that
- ☐ Would not say that

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1 & DOG_CURR = 2

DOG_FAMILY_PAST.

Would you say your dog was a member of your family, or would you not say that?

- ☐ Would say that
- ☐ Would not say that

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1 & DOG_CURR = 1

DOG_FAMILY_PRES.

Would you say your dog is a member your family, or would you not say that?

- ☐ Would say that
- ☐ Would not say that

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1

DOGS_FAMILY.

Would you say any of your dogs were a member of your family, or would you not say that?

- ☐ Would say that
- ☐ Would not say that

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1

DOG_BED.

Did you ever allow your dog to be on the bed where you slept, or did you never do that?

- ☐ Did that
- ☐ Never did that

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1

DOGS_BED.

Did you ever allow any of your dogs to be on the bed where you slept, or did you never do that?

- ☐ Did that
- ☐ Never did that

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1

DOG_PHOTO.

Did you ever pay a professional photographer to take pictures of your dog, or did you never do that?

- ☐ Did that
- ☐ Never did that

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1

DOGS_PHOTO.

Did you ever pay a professional photographer to take pictures of any of your dogs, or did you never do that?

- ☐ Did that
- ☐ Never did that

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1

DOG_PARK.

Did you ever take your dog to a fenced-in area of a public park where dogs can run without being on leashes, or did you never do that?

- ☐ Did that
- ☐ Never did that

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1

DOGS_PARK.

Did you ever take any of your dogs to a fenced-in area of a public park where dogs can run without being on leashes, or did you never do that?

- ☐ Did that
- ☐ Never did that

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1 & DOG_CURR = 1

DOG_HEALTHY_PRES.

How important to you is it that your dog is as **healthy** as possible? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

- ☐ Extremely important
- ☐ Very important
- ☐ Moderately important
- ☐ Slightly important
- ☐ Not important at all

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1 & DOG_CURR = 2

DOG_HEALTHY_PAST.

How important to you was it that your dog was as **healthy** as possible? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

- ☐ Extremely important
- ☐ Very important
- ☐ Moderately important
- ☐ Slightly important
- ☐ Not important at all

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1 & DOG_CURR = 1

DOGS_HEALTHY_PRES.

How important to you is it that your dogs are as **healthy** as possible? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

- ☐ Extremely important
- ☐ Very important
- ☐ Moderately important
- ☐ Slightly important
- ☐ Not important at all

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1 & DOG_CURR = 2

DOGS_HEALTHY_PAST.

How important to you was it that your dogs were as **healthy** as possible? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

- ☐ Extremely important
- ☐ Very important
- ☐ Moderately important
- ☐ Slightly important
- ☐ Not important at all

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1 & DOG_CURR = 1

DOG_SAFE_PRES.

How important to you is it that your dog is as **safe** as possible? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

- ☐ Extremely important
- ☐ Very important
- ☐ Moderately important
- ☐ Slightly important
- ☐ Not important at all

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1 & DOG_CURR = 2

DOG_SAFE_PAST.

How important to you was it that your dog was as **safe** as possible? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

- ☐ Extremely important
- ☐ Very important
- ☐ Moderately important
- ☐ Slightly important
- ☐ Not important at all

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1 & DOG_CURR = 1

DOGS_SAFE_PRES.

How important to you is it that your dogs are as **safe** as possible? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

- ☐ Extremely important
- ☐ Very important
- ☐ Moderately important
- ☐ Slightly important
- ☐ Not important at all

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1 & DOG_CURR = 2

DOGS_SAFE_PAST.

How important to you was it that your dogs were as **safe** as possible? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

- ☐ Extremely important
- ☐ Very important
- ☐ Moderately important
- ☐ Slightly important
- ☐ Not important at all

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1

DOG_VET.

Did you ever take your dog to a veterinarian when it was not sick or injured, to find out if it was generally healthy, or did you never do that?

- ☐ Did that
- ☐ Never did that

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1

DOGS_VET.

Did you ever take any of your dogs to a veterinarian when they were not sick or injured, to find out if they were generally healthy, or did you never do that?

- ☐ Did that
- ☐ Never did that

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1

DOG_TEETH.

Did you ever have your dog's teeth cleaned at a veterinarian's office, or did you never do that?

- ☐ Did that
- ☐ Never did that

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1

DOGS_TEETH.

Did you ever have any of your dogs' teeth cleaned at a veterinarian's office, or did you never do that?

- ☐ Did that
- ☐ Never did that

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1

DOG_MED.

Did you ever give your dog a medicine prescribed by a veterinarian, or did you never do that?

- ☐ Did that
- ☐ Never did that

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1

DOGS_MED.

Did you ever give any of your dogs a medicine prescribed by a veterinarian, or did you never do that?

- ☐ Did that
- ☐ Never did that

Next

DISPLAY IF FOOD_EVER = 1 & DOG_EVER = 1

FOOD_VETREC.

Did you ever buy a dog food that was recommended to you by a veterinarian, or did you never do that?

- ☐ Did that
- ☐ Never did that

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1

DOG_CHIPPED.

Did you ever have someone put a microchip in your dog so you could find it, or did you never do that?

- ☐ Did that
- ☐ Never did that

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1

DOGS_CHIPPED.

Did you ever have someone put a microchip in any of your dogs so you could find it, or did you never do that?

- ☐ Did it
- ☐ Never did it

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 0

BOOKS_HEALTH.

Did you ever read books, magazines, or information online to learn about how to keep dogs healthy, or did you never do that?

- ☐ Did that
- ☐ Never did that

Next

DISPLAY IF FOOD_EVER = 1 & DOG_EVER = 1

FOOD_PETSTORE.

Did you ever buy dog food from a store that sells only pet supplies, or did you never do that?

- ☐ Did that
- ☐ Never did that

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 0

BOOKS_INGRED.

Did you ever read books, magazines, or information online to learn about what ingredients are in dog foods to decide which ones to buy, or did you never do that?

- ☐ Did that
- ☐ Never did that

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1

FOOD_ALLNATURAL.

If you were to buy dog food, when deciding which food to buy, how much attention would you pay to whether or not the food is **all-natural**? A great deal of attention, a lot of attention, a moderate amount of attention, a little attention, or none at all?

- ☐ A great deal
- ☐ A lot
- ☐ A moderate amount
- ☐ A little
- ☐ None at all

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1

FOOD_GRAINFREE.

If you were to buy dog food, when deciding which food to buy, how much attention would you pay to whether or not the food is **grain free**? A great deal of attention, a lot of attention, a moderate amount of attention, a little attention, or none at all?

- ☐ A great deal
- ☐ A lot
- ☐ A moderate amount
- ☐ A little
- ☐ None at all

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1

FOOD_ORGANIC.

If you were to buy dog food, when deciding which food to buy, how much attention would you pay to whether or not the food is **organic**? A great deal of attention, a lot of attention, a moderate amount of attention, a little attention, or none at all?

- ☐ A great deal
- ☐ A lot
- ☐ A moderate amount
- ☐ A little
- ☐ None at all

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1

FOOD_TASTE.

If you were to buy dog food, when deciding which food to buy, how much attention would you pay to whether or not the food **tastes good to dogs**? A great deal of attention, a lot of attention, a moderate amount of attention, a little attention, or none at all?

- ☐ A great deal
- ☐ A lot
- ☐ A moderate amount
- ☐ A little
- ☐ None at all

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1

FOOD_HEALTH.

If you were to buy dog food, when deciding which food to buy, how much attention would you pay to whether or not the food will **improve the health of dogs**? A great deal of attention, a lot of attention, a moderate amount of attention, a little attention, or none at all?

- ☐ A great deal
- ☐ A lot
- ☐ A moderate amount
- ☐ A little
- ☐ None at all

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1

FOOD_APPEARANCE.

If you were to buy dog food, when deciding which food to buy, how much attention would you pay to whether or not the food will **improve the appearance of dogs**? A great deal of attention, a lot of attention, a moderate amount of attention, a little attention, or none at all?

- ☐ A great deal
- ☐ A lot
- ☐ A moderate amount
- ☐ A little
- ☐ None at all

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1

DOG_FOOD_COOK.

Did you ever cook food that your dog ate, or did you never do that?

- ☐ Did that
- ☐ Never did that

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1

DOGS_FOOD_COOK.

Did you ever cook food that any of your dogs ate, or did you never do that?

- ☐ Did that
- ☐ Never did that

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1

DOG_FOODSPEND.

During the time when you have owned a dog, how much money did you spend for your dog's food per month, on average?

Please round to the nearest dollar and type the amount in the box below.

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1

DOGS_FOODSPEND.

During the time when you have owned dogs, how much money did you spend for your dogs' food per month, on average?

Please round to the nearest dollar and type the amount in the box below.

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 0

HARNESS.

Did you ever put a dog in a harness, car seat, or crate when transporting it in a motor vehicle, or did you never do that?

- ☐ Did that
- ☐ Never did that

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 0

DONATE.

Did you ever donate money to an animal shelter or animal rescue group, or did you never do that?

- ☐ Did that
- ☐ Never did that

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1

DOG_UNDERSTAND.

How well has your dog understood what you said to it? Extremely well, very well, moderately well, slightly well, or not well at all?

- ☐ Extremely well
- ☐ Very well
- ☐ Moderately well
- ☐ Slightly well
- ☐ Not well at all

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1

DOGS_UNDERSTAND.

How well have your dogs understood what you said to them? Extremely well, very well, moderately well, slightly well, or not well at all?

- ☐ Extremely well
- ☐ Very well
- ☐ Moderately well
- ☐ Slightly well
- ☐ Not well at all

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1

DOG_BIRTHDAY.

Did you ever celebrate the birthday of your dog, or did you never do that?

- ☐ Did that
- ☐ Never did that

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1

DOGS_BIRTHDAY.

Did you ever celebrate the birthday of any of your dogs, or did you never do that?

- ☐ Did that
- ☐ Never did that

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1

DOG_HOLIDAY.

Did you ever give your dog a gift for a holiday other than a birthday, or did you never do that?

- ☐ Did that
- ☐ Never did that

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1
DOGS_HOLIDAY.

Did you ever give any of your dogs a gift for a holiday other than a birthday, or did you never do that?

- ☐ Did that
- ☐ Never did that

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1
DOG_TRAINER.

Did you ever pay for obedience training for your dog, or did you never do that?

- ☐ Did that
- ☐ Never did that

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1
DOGS_TRAINER.

Did you ever pay for obedience training for any of your dogs, or did you never do that?

- ☐ Did that
- ☐ Never did that

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 0

INSURANCE.

Did you ever buy health insurance for a dog, or did you never do that?

- ☐ Did that
- ☐ Never did that

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1

DOG_ANNOY.

How often has your dog done things that annoyed you? Extremely often, very often, moderately often, slightly often, or not often at all?

- ☐ Extremely often
- ☐ Very often
- ☐ Moderately often
- ☐ Slightly often
- ☐ Not often at all

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1

DOGS_ANNOY.

How often have your dogs done things that annoyed you? Extremely often, very often, moderately often, slightly often, or not often at all?

- ☐ Extremely often
- ☐ Very often
- ☐ Moderately often
- ☐ Slightly often
- ☐ Not often at all

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 0

VIDEO.

Did you ever watch a television program or video featuring a dog expert or animal trainer, or did you never do that?

- ☐ Did that
- ☐ Never did that

Next

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 0

BOOKS_TRAINER.

Did you ever read a book or article by a dog expert or animal trainer, or did you never do that?

- ☐ Did that
- ☐ Never did that

Next

Now we'd like to ask some questions about you.

P_30EXERCISE.

How many times per week, on average, do you get 30 or more minutes of exercise?

Next

P_DIET.

During the last month, how healthy was the food you ate? Extremely healthy, very healthy, moderately healthy, slightly healthy, or not healthy at all?

- ☐ Extremely healthy
- ☐ Very healthy
- ☐ Moderately healthy
- ☐ Slightly healthy
- ☐ Not healthy at all

Next

P_SHOP_ORGANIC.

When you shopped for groceries during the last month, did you ever buy **organic** products, or did you not do that?

- ☐ Did that
- ☐ Did not do that

Next

P_SHOP_NONGMO.

When you shopped for groceries during the last month, did you ever buy **non-GMO** products, or did you not do that?

- ☐ Did that
- ☐ Did not do that

Next

P_SHOP_LOCAL.

When you shopped for groceries during the last month, did you ever buy products that were **grown locally** or did you not do that?

- ☐ Did that
- ☐ Did not do that

Next

DEMO_INST.

The last few questions are for statistical purposes. You may have answered similar questions like this in the past. We appreciate your patience in answering them now.

Next

SEX.

What is your sex?

- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female

Next

MARITAL.

Are you now married, widowed, divorced, separated, or never married?

- ☐ Married
- ☐ Widowed
- ☐ Divorced
- ☐ Separated
- ☐ Never married

Next

QINCOME1.

The next question is about your family income. This includes income from jobs, pensions, social security, interest, child support, dividends, profits from businesses or farms, or any other sources of income.

If you live alone, your family income is just your total income. If you live with other family members, your family income includes your total income plus the incomes of any of the family members who live with you.

During 2018, what was your total family income, before taxes?

Type in the number for the answer

\$

Next

DISPLAY IF QINCOME1 is answered

QINCOME1_CHECK. [NOTE THE VALUE BELOW (\$10000) WILL CHANGE ACCORDING TO RESPONDENT ANSWER TO QINCOME1]

Just to be sure our computer is recording your answer correctly, did you mean to type that your total family income in 2018 before taxes was \$10000, or was it a different number?

- ☐ Yes, I meant to type that number.
- ☐ No, I meant to type a different number.

Next

DISPLAY IF QINCOME1 is NOT answered, or QINCOME2 is asked, but NOT answered

QINCOME2A.

Was it \$40,000 or more in 2018?

- ☐ \$40,000 or more
- ☐ Less than \$40,000

Next

DISPLAY IF QINCOME2A = 1
QINCOME2B.

Was it \$50,000 or more?

- ☐ \$50,000 or more
- ☐ Less than \$50,000

Next

DISPLAY IF QINCOME2B = 1
QINCOME2C.

Was it \$60,000 or more?

- ☐ \$60,000 or more
- ☐ Less than \$60,000

Next

DISPLAY IF QINCOME2C = 1
QINCOME2D.

Was it \$75,000 or more?

- ☐ \$75,000 or more
- ☐ Less than \$75,000

Next

DISPLAY IF QINCOME2D = 1
QINCOME2E.

Was it \$100,000 or more?

- ☐ \$100,000 or more
- ☐ Less than \$100,000

Next

DISPLAY IF QINCOME2E = 1
QINCOME2F.

Was it \$150,000 or more?

- ☐ \$150,000 or more
- ☐ Less than \$150,000

Next

DISPLAY IF QINCOME2A = 2
QINCOME2G.

Was it \$5,000 or more?

- ☐ \$5,000 or more
- ☐ Less than \$5,000

Next

DISPLAY IF QINCOME2G = 1

QINCOME2H.

Was it \$10,000 or more?

- ☐ \$10,000 or more
- ☐ Less than \$10,000

Next

DISPLAY IF QINCOME2H = 1

QINCOME2I.

Was it \$15,000 or more?

- ☐ \$15,000 or more
- ☐ Less than \$15,000

Next

DISPLAY IF QINCOME2I = 1

QINCOME2J.

Was it \$20,000 or more?

- ☐ \$20,000 or more
- ☐ Less than \$20,000

Next

DISPLAY IF QINCOME2J = 1
QINCOME2K.

Was it \$25,000 or more?

- ☐ \$25,000 or more
- ☐ Less than \$25,000

Next

DISPLAY IF QINCOME2K = 1
QINCOME2L.

Was it \$30,000 or more?

- ☐ \$30,000 or more
- ☐ Less than \$30,000

Next

THANK.

Thank you for answering these questions today. Please click the blue button to return to the AmeriSpeak website to submit your answers.

Please do not close your browser until you return to the AmeriSpeak website.

Next

ERROR_MESSAGE.

We noticed that you didn't answer the question below. We would be really grateful if you'd be willing to answer it as accurately as you can, even if you're not completely sure of your answer. But if you prefer not to answer the question, just click on the blue button below.

To begin, have you ever owned a dog, or have you never owned a dog?

- ☐ Have owned a dog
- ☐ Have never owned a dog

Next

Appendix C

NORC Field Report
(including information about the panel)

PET FOODS 2019

GUSTAFSON GLUEK PLLC

AMERISPEAK FIELD REPORT

April 2, 2019

NORC Account Manager: Dan Costanzo | Costanzo-Dan@norc.org
J. Michael Dennis | Dennis-Michael@norc.org

NORC Project Manager: Jennifer Marek | Marek-Jennifer@norc.org

Study Introduction

NORC conducted the Pet Foods Study 2019 on behalf of Gustafson Gluek PLLC (“the client”) using NORC’s AmeriSpeak® Panel for the sample source.

This survey was available in English and self-administered via the web mode of data collection. AmeriSpeak web- and phone-preference panelists were all offered the chance to complete the survey on the web. Detailed information below.

For more detailed information on the AmeriSpeak panel recruitment and management methodology, please see the NORC Appendix 1 (“Technical Notes on AmeriSpeak Methodology”) attached to this AmeriSpeak Field Report.

Study-specific details

Sampling

A general population sample of U.S. adults age 18 and older was selected from NORC’s AmeriSpeak Panel for this study. Both web-preference AmeriSpeak panelists and phone-preference AmeriSpeak panelists were eligible for selection to this study. In total, NORC sampled 24,881 Panelists for this study.

The sample for a specific study is selected from the AmeriSpeak Panel using sampling strata based on age, race/Hispanic ethnicity, education, and gender (48 sampling strata in total). The size of the selected sample per sampling stratum is determined by the population distribution for each stratum. In addition, sample selection takes into account expected differential survey completion rates by demographic groups so that the set of panel members with a completed interview for a study is a representative sample of the target population. If panel household has one more than one active adult panel member, only one adult in the household is eligible for selection (random within-household sampling). Panelists selected for an AmeriSpeak study earlier in the business week are not eligible for sample selection until the following business week.

For technical information about the AmeriSpeak Panel, including recruitment process and panel management policies, please see the Appendix.

Third Party Hosting of the Survey Questionnaire

NORC utilized a survey questionnaire programmed and tested by The Strategy Team, and hosted on Survey Gizmo to meet the needs of the study.

NORC programmed a “shell survey” in the standard AmeriSpeak look and feel for AmeriSpeak respondents to enter. The NORC-hosted shell survey redirected the AmeriSpeak respondents to the Survey Gizmo-hosted survey which collected the survey responses from the NORC AmeriSpeak respondents.

Upon reaching the end of the Survey Gizmo-hosted survey, AmeriSpeak respondents were redirected to the NORC-hosted shell, at which point they were counted as a completed survey interview and awarded an incentive for their participation in the survey.

Field

A sub-sample of 1,059 AmeriSpeak web-mode panelists were invited to the survey on March 20, 2019 in a soft-launch. The initial data from the soft-launch was reviewed by The Strategy Team and the remainder of sampled AmeriSpeak panelists (23,822) were invited to the survey on March 21, 2019.

Through the morning of April 2, 2019 6,728 interviews were completed.

Survey response rate information

Panel Recruitment Rate	34.2%
Panel Retention Rate	85.1%
Survey Completion Rate	27.0%
Cumulative Response Rate	8.4%

Gaining Cooperation of AmeriSpeak Panelists for the Study

NORC dialed the sampled phone-preference panelists to invite the panelists to the survey. When successful contact was made, NORC telephone interviewers invited the respondent to complete the online survey, collected an email address (or confirmed one already in our records) and provided a link to the survey via email to those who consented to being invited. The phone-preference panelists received the same email invitation sent to web-preference panelists.

NORC made an average of 3.4 dial attempts per phone-preference respondent. Below is a summary table of phone cases by final outcome achieved.

Last Outcome	Cases
Answering Machine	1513
Busy Signal	106
Ring No Answer	178
Answered but unavailable to talk	92
Completed	483
Language Barrier	10
Withdrawn from Panel or Phone Mode	64
Refusal	54
Web Breakoff	17
Respondent could or would not provide an email address	588
No valid phone number for respondent	623
Technical Issue	1
Grand Total	3729

Additionally, NORC sent pre-notification postcards to phone-preference Panelists on March 27, 2019. The postcards encouraged these phone-preference Panelists to complete the survey on the web (postcard screenshots are available in NORC Appendix 2).

To encourage study cooperation, NORC sent email reminders to sampled panelists on the following dates:

- March 20/21 – Invitation
- March 26 – Reminder 1
- March 27 – Postcard mailed to phone-preference Panelists
- March 29 – Reminder 2
- April 1 - Reminder 3
- April 2 - Reminder 4

Please see NORC Appendix 2 for screenshots of the emails sent to the AmeriSpeak panelists.

Panelists were offered the cash equivalent of \$5 for completing this survey. Per instruction from The Strategy Team, the incentive was increased to the cash equivalent of \$10 toward the end of the field period to encourage cooperation.

Data processing

NORC prepared a fully labeled data file of the demographic data for the entire invited sample.

Statistical Weighting

NORC provided the *study-specific base sampling weights* with the demographic data to allow The Strategy Team to derive post-stratification weights for the study respondents.

Study-specific base sampling weights are derived using a combination of the final *panel base sampling weights* and the probability of selection associated with the sampled panel member

Panel base sampling weights for all sampled housing units are computed as the inverse of probability of selection from the NORC National Frame (the sampling frame that is used to sample housing units for AmeriSpeak) or address-based sample. The sample design and recruitment protocol for the AmeriSpeak Panel involves subsampling of initial non-respondent housing units. These subsampled non-respondent housing units are selected for an in-person follow-up. The subsample of housing units that are selected for the nonresponse follow-up (NRFU) have their panel base sampling weights inflated by the inverse of the subsampling rate. The base sampling weights are further adjusted to account for unknown eligibility and nonresponse among eligible housing units. The household-level nonresponse adjusted weights are then post-stratified to external counts for number of households obtained from the Current Population Survey. Then, these household-level post-stratified weights are assigned to each eligible adult in every recruited household. Furthermore, a person-level nonresponse adjustment accounts for nonresponding adults within a recruited household.

Finally, *panel base sampling weights* are raked to external population totals associated with age, sex, education, race/ethnicity, housing tenure, telephone status, and Census Division. The external population totals are obtained from the Current Population Survey.

Deliverables

The following files were created as part of the study deliverables:

- Sampled respondent demographic data file in SPSS and Stata format
- Codebook in Excel format
- Final programming questionnaire in Word document
- Field report documenting study procedures

NORC Appendix 1

TECHNICAL OVERVIEW OF THE AMERISPEAK® PANEL NORC'S PROBABILITY-BASED HOUSEHOLD PANEL

Updated February 18, 2019

Prepared by J. Michael Dennis, Ph.D.

Funded and operated by NORC at the University of Chicago, AmeriSpeak® is a probability-based panel designed to be representative of the US household population. Randomly selected US households are sampled with a known, non-zero probability of selection from the NORC National Frame and address-based sample, and then contacted by US mail, telephone interviewers, overnight express mailers, and field interviewers (face to face). AmeriSpeak panelists participate in NORC studies or studies conducted by NORC on behalf of NORC's clients.

In 2018, the AmeriSpeak Panel expanded to approximately 30,000 households and will expand to 35,000 households in 2019. The AmeriSpeak Panel includes sample support for surveys of various segments through AmeriSpeak Latino, AmeriSpeak Teen, and AmeriSpeak Young Adult (which includes an oversample of African Americans, Hispanics, and Asians age 18-34). AmeriSpeak is also the probability-sample source for TrueNorth™, which combines probability-based AmeriSpeak and non-probability online samples using calibrating statistical weights derived from AmeriSpeak, the American Community Survey, and other data sources.¹⁴

Sample Frame

In order to provide a nationally representative sample, AmeriSpeak leverages the NORC National Frame, which provides sample coverage for over 97 percent of the U.S. households. The 2010 National Frame used a two-stage probability sample design to select a representative sample of households in the United States. The first stage—the sampling unit—is a National Frame Area (NFA), which is either an entire metropolitan area (made up of one or more counties) or a county (some counties were combined so that each NFA contains a population of at least 10,000). The largest NFAs with a population of at least 1,543,728 (0.5 percent of the 2010 Census U.S. population) were selected with certainty; these areas have a high-population density, and are dominated by tracts with street-style addresses. These areas contain 56 percent of the population within 8 percent of the geographic area of the United States. The remaining areas were stratified into areas where street-style addresses predominate, and the remaining areas, which are less likely to have street-style addresses. The latter stratum (“rural” areas) comprises 81 percent of the geographic area, but only 14 percent of the population.

Within the selected NFAs, the second stage sampling unit is a segment, defined in terms of either Census tracts or block groups, containing at least 300 housing units according to the 2010 Census. A stratified probability sample of 1,514 segments was selected with probability proportional to size. For most of the 1,514 segments, the U.S. Postal Service Delivery Sequence File (DSF) provided over 90 percent coverage of the segments in terms of city-style addresses that are geo-codeable. For the

¹⁴ For more information, see “Estimation Methods for Nonprobability Samples with a Companion Probability Sample” authored by Michael Yang, N. Ganesh, Edward Mulrow, and Vicki Pineau. Published in the 2018 JSM Proceedings, Survey Research Methods Section. Alexandria, VA: American Statistical Association. 1715-1723. The paper is available at <https://amerispeak.norc.org/research/>. Please note that the TrueNorth™ trademarking was in progress when this paper was published. Hence, the authors do not reference the TrueNorth™ name on this paper.

123 segments where the DSF provided insufficient coverage, we enhanced the DSF address list with in-person listing. The National Frame contains almost 3 million households, including over 80,000 rural households added through the in-person listing.

The National Frame involves addresses in almost every state. For the states that are not included in the National Frame, AmeriSpeak selected an address-based sample (ABS) in 2016 through 2018 from the USPS DSF to assure AmeriSpeak sample representation for all US States and Washington, DC.

In 2017, a targeted address-based sample was added to AmeriSpeak recruitment in order to develop a new Latino Panel with adequate representation of Spanish-language-dominant Hispanics. Census tracts with high incidence (at least 30%) of Spanish-dominant Hispanics were targeted for this recruitment. Furthermore, within these Census tracts, households that were flagged as Hispanic based on consumer vendor data (that are typically used for direct-mail marketing) were oversampled. This new AmeriSpeak Latino Panel contains approximately 5,400 Hispanic panelists with 24% of those panelists being Spanish-language dominant. As of February 2019, 11% of AmeriSpeak Panel (including the Latino Panel) recruited adults were sourced from the targeted address-based sample and 89% from the National Frame. Proper weights allow the full use of the combined sample.

Sample Selection for Panel Recruitment

The 2014-2018 AmeriSpeak Panel sample consists of nationally representative housing units drawn primarily from the 2010 NORC National Sample Frame. To create AmeriSpeak Latino and provide sample coverage for states where the National Frame is not operative, a secondary source is address-based sampling, which accounts for 12% of the 2014-2018 sample. The 2010 NORC National Sample Frame is stratified based on segment (Census tract or Census block group) characteristics such as age and race/ethnicity composition of the segment, and then, a stratified simple random sample of housing units is selected. Specifically, based on Census tract-level data, segments were classified as having a higher concentration of 18-24 year old adults or not, and a higher concentration of Hispanics, non-Hispanic African Americans, and other. Based on these strata definitions, 6 strata (2 based on age times 3 based on race/ethnicity) were used to oversample housing units in segments higher in young adults and/or Hispanics and non-Hispanic African-Americans. This is referred to as the initial sample or first stage of panel recruitment.

In the second stage of panel recruitment, initially sampled but nonresponding housing units are subsampled for a nonresponse follow-up (NRFU). At this stage, consumer vendor data are matched to housing units, and housing units that are flagged (based on consumer vendor data) as having a young adult (18-34 years of age) or minority (Hispanic and non-Hispanic African American) are oversampled for the NRFU. Overall, approximately one in five initially nonresponding housing units are subsampled for NRFU. Due to NRFU, these initially nonresponding housing units have a much higher selection probability compared to the housing units that were recruited during the first stage of panel recruitment. Note that a small fraction of initially nonresponding housing units are not eligible for NRFU due to these housing units being classified as “hard refusals” or having an appointment for a call back from NORC.

In summary, there are mainly two reasons why the sampling design for AmeriSpeak Panel recruitment deviates from Equal Probability of Selection Method (EPSEM) sampling: (a) oversampling of housing units in segments with a higher concentration of young adults and minorities results in the sample selection probabilities being higher for housing units in these

segments; and (b) the nonresponse follow-up effort results in initially nonresponding housing units having a much higher selection probability. Furthermore, oversampling associated with NRFU results in higher selection probabilities for initially nonresponding housing units that are flagged (based on consumer vendor data) using demographics that are correlated with sample member's propensity to respond. The initial and NRFU sampling procedures are examined and modified each year to more efficiently recruit types of panelists who are less likely to respond based on their certain demographic characteristics.

AmeriSpeak Panel Recruitment Procedures

Recruitment is a two-stage process: initial recruitment using less expensive methods and then non-response follow-up using personal interviewers. For the initial recruitment, sample units are invited to join AmeriSpeak online by visiting the panel website AmeriSpeak.org or by telephone (in-bound/outbound supported). English and Spanish language are supported for both online and telephone recruitment. Study invitations are communicated via an over-sized pre-notification postcard, a USPS recruitment package in a 9"x12" envelope (containing a cover letter, a summary of the privacy policy, FAQs, and a study brochure), two follow-up post cards, and also contact by NORC's telephone research center for sample units matched to a telephone number.

The second-stage non-response follow-up targets a stratified random sub-sample of the non-responders from the initial recruitment. Units sampled for the non-response follow-up are sent by Federal Express a new recruitment package with an enhanced incentive offer. NORC field interviewers then make personal, face-to-face visits to the respondents' homes to encourage participation. NORC field interviewers administer the recruitment survey in-person using CAPI or else encourage the respondents to register at AmeriSpeak.org or call the toll-free AmeriSpeak telephone number to register.

Recruiting Non-Internet and "Net Averse" Households

Under certain conditions, AmeriSpeak gives panelists a choice regarding their preferred mode for future participation in AmeriSpeak surveys. As of February 2019, 83% of the active panelists were enrolled in AmeriSpeak to receive online surveys, while 17% of the active panelists agreed to participate in AmeriSpeak telephone mode surveys. For the 2016 through 2018 recruitment, respondents provided an option of online or telephone modes include: persons without internet access, persons whose only internet access is via a smartphone, and persons with internet access but unwilling to share an email address. A recruited household can consist of both web-mode and phone-mode panelists residing in the same household.

Impact of Non-Response Follow-up

The non-response follow-up (NRFU) is instrumental for producing a credible AAPOR response rate for the panel, boosting the panel recruitment response rate by a factor of 6.1 (AAPOR RR3, weighted to take into account selection probabilities). Additionally, NRFU reduces non-response bias significantly by improving the representativeness of the AmeriSpeak panel sample with respect to certain hard-to-reach segments of the population underrepresented by recruitment relying only mail and phone. NRFU improves representation for demographic segments (typically more reluctant to respond to surveys), including lower income households, cell-phone only households, renters, persons age 18 to 34, African Americans, Hispanics, and persons without a high school degree or have only a high school degree (no college). Even though NRFU panelists are more reluctant to complete surveys, the addition of NRFU panelists reduced total absolute bias on average 5-21%

when compared to the initial stage recruits (among examined surveys).¹⁵ Compared to panelists recruited in the initial stage, panelists recruited via the non-response follow-up campaign overall report more moderate opinions towards policy issues and are somewhat more conservative. Based on study specific findings, NRFU panelists report being less knowledgeable about science, report less interest in current events and topics in the news (such as climate change and energy resources), and are less likely to read a print newspaper (more likely to read the news online and use social media).¹⁶ They are also more likely to attend church, less likely to be in favor of gun control policies, and more likely to eat at a fast food restaurant than the initial stage recruits. Accordingly, our extensive research on this topic illustrates that NRFU panelists make the substantive estimates in any AmeriSpeak study more inclusive and accurate.

AmeriSpeak Panel Recruitment Response Rate and Other Sample Metrics

The AAPOR RR3 (response rate) for the 2014-2018 panel recruitment 34.2% (weighted to take into account selection probabilities).¹⁷ The estimated cumulative AAPOR RR3 for client surveys is 10% to 20% (varying according to study parameters and taking into account all sources of non-response including panel recruitment, panel household attrition, and survey participation).¹⁸ NORC documented the AAPOR response rate calculation methodology for 2014-2015 recruitment.¹⁹

Key statistics with respect to the 2014-2018 recruited households are as follows: 52% recruited via the non-response follow-up recruitment using overnight Federal Express mailers and face-to-face methodology (with NORC field staff visiting households); 22% indicated a preference for the telephone mode of data collection for participating in AmeriSpeak studies; 25% of the recruited households are non-Internet²⁰; 79% are cell-phone only or cell-phone mostly; 17% are African-American and 23% Hispanic; and 35% have household income below \$30,000 (compared to CPS benchmark of 26%).²¹

Mixed-Mode Data Collection

Panelists may participate in two to three AmeriSpeak Panel studies per month via online (computer,

¹⁵ See “Nonresponse Follow-up Impact on AmeriSpeak Panel Sample Composition and Representativeness” authored by Ipek Bilgen, J. Michael Dennis, N. Ganesh. The paper is available at <https://amerispeak.norc.org/research/>;

Total Absolute Error = [Sum(| ACS 2016 Benchmark - Unweighted Variable Percentage Point |)]; see pages 8-13.

¹⁶ See “The Undercounted: Measuring the Impact of ‘Nonresponse Follow-up’ on Research Data and Outcome Measures” authored by Ipek Bilgen, J. Michael Dennis, N. Ganesh. The paper will be soon available at <https://amerispeak.norc.org/research/>.

¹⁷ The response rate calculation incorporates the selection probabilities of the samples for the initial recruitment and non-response follow-up stages, as calculated by the US Bureau of the Census for the American Community Survey.

¹⁸ A properly calculated cumulative AAPOR response rate for panel-based research takes into account all sources of non-response at each stage of the panel recruitment, management, and survey administration process. A common misapplication of the term “response rate” in online panel surveys is to represent the survey-specific cooperation rate as the “cumulative survey response rate.”

¹⁹ See “Response Rate Calculation Methodology for Recruitment of a Two-Phase Probability-Based Panel: The Case of AmeriSpeak” authored by Robert Montgomery, J. Michael Dennis, N. Ganesh. The paper is available at <https://amerispeak.norc.org/research/>.

²⁰ The non-internet households (HHs) are those that do not select “High-speed, broadband internet at home (such as cable or DSL)” or “Dial-up internet at home” response options when they are asked “What kind of internet access do you have? Please select all that apply” item in the recruitment survey. The non-internet HHs include those that only use internet on a cell connection or mobile phone.

²¹ For transparency purposes, unweighted percentages are presented in this section. Hence, these results do not take into account oversampling and selection probabilities. The base weighted distributions that take into account selection probabilities can be provided upon request.

tablet, or smartphones) or by CATI phone. CATI phone mode respondents represent a population currently under-represented in web panels that exclude non-internet households or “net averse” persons. NORC’s telephone interviewers administer the phone mode of survey questionnaires using a data collection system supporting both the phone and web modes of data collection, providing an integrated sample management and data collection platform. For panelists using smartphones for web-mode AmeriSpeak surveys, the NORC survey system renders an optimized presentation of the survey questions for these mobile users. For general population client studies, approximately 17% of the completed interviews by the active panelists are completed via the telephone mode.

Panel Management Policies

NORC maintains strict rules to limit respondent burden and reduce the risk of panel fatigue. On average, AmeriSpeak panel members typically participate in AmeriSpeak web-based or phone-based studies two to three times a month.

Because the risk of panel attrition increases with the fielding of poorly constructed survey questionnaires, the AmeriSpeak team works with NORC clients to create surveys that provide an appropriate user experience for AmeriSpeak panelists. AmeriSpeak will not field surveys that in our professional opinion will result in a poor user experience for our panelists and in panel attrition.

About NORC at the University of Chicago

As one of the world’s foremost independent research institutions, NORC at the University of Chicago delivers objective data and meaningful analysis to help decision-makers and leading organizations make informed choices and identify new opportunities. Since 1941, NORC has applied sophisticated methods and tools, innovative and cost-effective solutions, and the highest standards of scientific integrity and quality to conduct and advance research on critical issues. Today, NORC expands on this tradition by partnering with government, business, and nonprofit clients to create deep insight across a broad range of topics and to disseminate useful knowledge throughout society.

Headquartered in downtown Chicago, NORC works in over 40 countries around the world, with additional offices on the University of Chicago campus, the DC metro area, Atlanta, Boston, and San Francisco.

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES


To learn more about AmeriSpeak or to share an RFP, please contact AmeriSpeak at AmeriSpeak-BD@norc.org. Information about AmeriSpeak capabilities and research papers are available online at AmeriSpeak.NORC.org.

NORC APPENDIX 2

Invitation Email

Email Subject: SID 811 - An Invitation To Complete Your AmeriSpeak Survey

A new AmeriSpeak survey is waiting for you. [View it in your browser.](#)



AN INVITATION TO

COMPLETE YOUR AmeriSpeak SURVEY

SID: [SURVEYID]

Begin your survey and

Earn [INCENTWCOMMA] AmeriPoints

Hello [FIRSTNAME],

We have a new **AmeriSpeak** survey for you!

Please complete it at your earliest convenience.

[Begin your survey](#)

Thank you for your time today. We look forward to hearing from you — and hearing your opinions!

Sincerely,


The AmeriSpeak Support Team

AmeriSpeak Support
Having trouble with the link? You can copy and paste this into your browser: [https://survey.amerispeak.org/SE/7/\[SPURLPARAMS\]](https://survey.amerispeak.org/SE/7/[SPURLPARAMS]). Alternatively, you can also go to [my.AmeriSpeak.org](https://my.amerispeak.org), log in using your member credentials and click on the "Start Survey" button in your dashboard page.
Need more help or have questions? Email the AmeriSpeak Support Team at support@AmeriSpeak.org or call toll-free (888) 326-9424

Reminder 1

Email Subject: SID 811 - An Invitation To Complete Your AmeriSpeak Survey

A new AmeriSpeak survey is waiting for you. [View it in your browser.](#)



AN INVITATION TO

COMPLETE YOUR AmeriSpeak SURVEY

Hello [FIRSTNAME],

Just a reminder, we have a new [AmeriSpeak](#) survey for you!

Please complete it at your earliest convenience.

[Begin your survey](#)

As you know, once you have 10,000 [AmeriPoints](#), you can redeem them for merchandise, Visa™ debit cards, and more!

Thank you for your time today.

We look forward to hearing from you — and hearing your opinions.

Sincerely,

The AmeriSpeak Support Team


AmeriSpeak Support
Having trouble with the link? You can copy and paste this into your browser: [https://survey.amerispeak.org/SE/?\[SPURLPARAMS\]](https://survey.amerispeak.org/SE/?[SPURLPARAMS]). Alternatively, you can also go to [my.AmeriSpeak.org](#), log in using your member credentials and click on the "Start Survey" button in your dashboard page.
Need more help or have questions? Email the AmeriSpeak Support Team at support@AmeriSpeak.org or call toll-free (888) 326-9424.

Reminder 2

Email Subject: SID 811 –EARN DOUBLE POINTS for this survey: worth 10,000

AmeriPoints!

A new AmeriSpeak survey is waiting for you. [View it in your browser.](#)



AN INVITATION TO

COMPLETE YOUR AmeriSpeak SURVEY

SID: [SURVEYID]

Begin your survey and
Earn [INCENTWCOMMA] AmeriPoints

Hello [FIRSTNAME],

Your new AmeriSpeak survey is ready. You will earn [INCENTWCOMMA] points, worth \$10.

Please complete it at your earliest convenience.

[Begin your survey](#)

You will need to do this before [INSERT DATE AND TIME] (local time).

Thank you for your time today.

We look forward to hearing from you — and hearing your opinions.

Sincerely,

The AmeriSpeak Support Team

AmeriSpeak Support
Having trouble with the link? You can copy and paste this into your browser: [https://survey.amerispeak.org/SE/?\[SPURLPARAMS\]](https://survey.amerispeak.org/SE/?[SPURLPARAMS]). Alternatively, you can also go to my.AmeriSpeak.org, log in using your member credentials and click on the "Start Survey" button in your dashboard page.
Need more help or have questions? Email the AmeriSpeak Support Team at support@AmeriSpeak.org or call toll-free (888) 326-9424

Reminder 3

Email Subject: Last Chance for Your Latest AmeriSpeak Survey worth 10,000 points!

A new AmeriSpeak survey is waiting for you. [View it in your browser.](#)

SID: [SURVEYID]

[Begin your survey](#) and

Earn [INCENTWCOMMA] AmeriPoints

Hello [FIRSTNAME],

Tomorrow is the LAST DAY when you can complete your new AmeriSpeak survey.

Your voice will represent people just like you all across the nation, so we are hoping you will have a moment to click on this link now:

[Begin your survey](#)

Thank you for your time today.

We look forward to hearing from you — and hearing your opinions.

Sincerely,

The AmeriSpeak Support Team

This email is intended for [FIRSTNAME] ([MEMBER PIN]).

AmeriSpeak Support
Having trouble with the link? You can copy and paste this into your browser: <https://survey.amerispeak.org/SE/71SPURLPARAMS/>. Alternatively, you can also go to [myAmeriSpeak.org](#), log in using your member credentials and click on the "Start Survey" button in your dashboard page.
Need more help or have questions? Email the AmeriSpeak Support Team at support@AmeriSpeak.org or call toll-free (888) 326-9424

Introduction Screen



This survey's screens will look a bit different than the screens you're used to seeing. When you finish the survey, you'll see a screen that looks like this one.

You will earn points for your participation.

Please click "Continue".

If you have any questions, you can contact us at 1-888-326-9424 or support@AmeriSpeak.org

PREVIOUS

CONTINUE

Closing Screen



Thank you for your time today. To help us improve the experience of AmeriSpeak members like yourself, please give us feedback on this survey.

If you do not have any feedback for us today, please click "Continue" through to the end of the survey so we can make sure your opinions are counted and for you to receive your AmeriPoints reward.

Please rate this survey overall from 1 to 7 where 1 is Poor and 7 is Excellent.

- ☐ 1 - Poor
- ☐ 2
- ☐ 3
- ☐ 4
- ☐ 5
- ☐ 6
- ☐ 7 - Excellent

Did you experience any technical issues in completing this survey?

- ☐ Yes - please tell us more in the next question
- ☐ No

Do you have any general comments or feedback on this survey you would like to share? If you would like a response from us, please email support@AmeriSpeak.org or call (888) 326-9424.

CONTINUE

Postcard for Phone-Preference Panelists
(Front)



Dear [FIRSTNAME],

Thank you for your continued participation in AmeriSpeak. Today, we are reaching out to you about a web-only survey that is available for you. Please call us toll-free at (888) 326-9424 and type in your PIN number or visit www.Amerispeak.org/member to learn more. Thank you.

Sincerely,

AmeriSpeak
55 E. Monroe St., 19th
Chicago, IL 60603

Postcard for Phone-Preference Panelists
(Back)



55 E. Monroe St., 19th Floor
Chicago, IL 60603

[FIRSTNAME] [LASTNAME]
[ADDRESS]
[CITY], [STATE] [ZIPCODE]

Appendix D

Sample Characteristics and Weighting

Benchmarking

Benchmarks for this study were drawn from three large federal surveys of the American adult population: the Current Population Survey (CPS), the American Community Survey (ACS), and the National Health Interview Survey (NHIS). The goal when drawing benchmarks from these samples, as for any benchmarking exercise, was to simultaneously maximize the accuracy of the method used to generate the benchmarking sample and to draw data from the most recent possible study so that the numbers used are timely. These datasets have been the most commonly used in benchmarking studies because they have involved large samples of Americans, used gold standard survey methods, were conducted on a regular basis, and have had high response rates.

Current Population Survey (CPS)

OVERVIEW

The CPS is a monthly survey of households that provides data on employment and demographic characteristics of household members. The CPS uses rotating samples of households. Randomly selected housing units are surveyed every month for four months, are not surveyed for the next eight months, and then are surveyed again every month for four months. Housing units are weighted to account for probability of selection and unit non-response. Each household member is weighted to account for: (1) probability of household selection; (2) unit non-response; (3) deviations from known population distributions of demographic characteristics.

Demographic and labor force data are collected during the monthly CPS interviews. One knowledgeable adult in a household (called the household informant) provides information about the age, sex, marital status, educational attainment, race, ethnicity, veteran and current armed

forces statuses, citizenship status, and relationship to the person who owns or rents the home for all people who usually live in the housing unit. Although CPS interviewers attempt to obtain labor force data from each household member, data for approximately half of these members are provided by proxies.

Some CPS interviews are conducted face-to-face, and others are conducted via telephone. Unless the household informant specifically requests a telephone interview, every informant for a household that has not previously completed a CPS interview participates in a face-to-face interview.

CPS MARCH 2018 SURVEY

The March 2018 CPS survey included a demographics questionnaire, a labor force questionnaire, and an Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC). Informants in households participating in a CPS interview for the first time answered questions in the demographics questionnaire about the age, sex, marital status, educational attainment, race, ethnicity, veteran and current armed forces statuses, citizenship status, and relationship to the person who owns or rents the home for all people who usually live in the housing unit. Informants in households that previously participated in a CPS interview answered questions about any changes to the people living in the household. Household members or household informants completing the labor force questionnaire answered questions about work-related activities during a target week. Household members or household informants completing the ASEC questionnaire answered questions about work experience, income, noncash benefits, and migration.

MARCH 2017 DATA USED FOR ADDITIONAL BENCHMARKS

Data used to generate some of the additional benchmarks are derived from the addresses of eligible and participating randomly sampled households. The addresses of randomly sampled households are used to determine the census regions and metropolitan statuses for participating households. The metropolitan status of the county in which a household is located is determined by standards developed by the United States Office of Management and Budget. Those standards define a metropolitan statistical area as:

A Core Based Statistical Area associated with at least one urbanized area that has a population of at least 50,000. The Metropolitan Statistical Area comprises the central county or counties containing the core, plus adjacent outlying counties having a high degree of social and economic integration with the central county or counties as measured through commuting.²² Household size benchmarks are derived from information provided by household informants when developing the household roster. Household informants answer questions about the people residing in, and relations among the people residing in the household. Answers to these questions are used to identify the number of individuals living in the participating household, which the CPS defines as:

A household consists of all the persons who occupy a house, an apartment, or other group of rooms, or a room, which constitutes a housing unit. A group of rooms or a single room is regarded as a housing unit when it is occupied as separate living quarters; that is, when the occupants do not live with any other person in the structure, and when there is direct access from the outside or through a common hall. The count of households excludes

²² United States Office of Management and Budget (2010). 2010 Standards for Delineating Metropolitan and Micropolitan Statistical Areas; Notice. Available at <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/metro-micro/about/omb-standards.html>.

persons living in group quarters, such as military barracks and institutions. Inmates of institutions (mental hospitals, rest homes, correctional institutions, etc.) are not included in the survey.²³

The following questions are used to build the roster:

(What are the names of all persons living or staying here? / What is the name of the next person)?

Is this (name of person talking about)'s usual place of residence?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Proxy

Does (name of person talking about) have a usual place of residence elsewhere?

1. Yes
2. No

Are there any other persons 15 years old or older now living or staying there? (Who have not been listed.)

1. Yes
2. No

How many other?

I have listed . . . READ NAMES. Have I missed any babies or small children?

1. Yes
2. No

Have I missed anyone who usually lives here but is away now -traveling, at school, or in a hospital?

1. Yes
2. No

Have I missed any lodgers, boarders, or persons you employ who live here?

1. Yes

²³ Current Population Survey (2017). 2017 Annual Social and Economic (ASEC) Supplement. Available at: <https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/techdocs/>.

2. No

Have I missed anyone else staying here?

1. Yes

2. No

What is the name of the person or one of the persons who owns or rents that home?

How (are / is) (name/you) related to (reference person's name/you)?

- 42. Opposite-sex Spouse (Husband/Wife)
- 43. Opposite-sex Unmarried Partner
- 44. Same-sex Spouse (Husband/Wife)
- 45. Same-sex Unmarried Partner
- 46. Child
- 47. Grandchild
- 48. Parent (Mother/Father)
- 49. Brother/Sister
- 50. Other relative (Aunt, Cousin, Nephew, Mother-in-law, etc.)
- 51. Foster_Child
- 52. Housemate/Roommate
- 53. Roomer/Boarder
- 54. Other nonrelative

Earlier you said that (name of person talking about) (was/were) not related to (reference person's name/you). (Are / Is) (name of person talking about) related to anyone else in this household?

1. Yes

2. No

Who (are / is) (name of person talking about) related to?

PROBE: Anyone else?

Ask if necessary: Is (name's/your) parent a member of this household?

(Are / Is) (name of person talking about) (your / mother's name) biological, step, or adopted child?

- 1. Biological
- 2. Step
- 3. Adopted

Ask if necessary: Is (name's/your) other parent a member of this household?

(Are / Is) (name of person talking about) (your / father's name) biological, step, or adopted child?

1. Biological
2. Step
3. Adopted

(REF_FNAME ^REF_LNAME's) parent is also (name of person talking about)'s parent, is that correct?

1. Yes
2. No

The Current Population Survey uses three different, nested units of observation. Data from the study are generated at the household level, the family level, and the person level for all individuals in each household. Because weighting is designed to yield a collection of persons who are nationally representative, it is necessary to translate household- and family-level variables to the person level. Also, because the data for most surveys is designed to represent the adult (18 and older) population, it is important to exclude children from all estimates. To accomplish this, metrics at the household and family level are appended to the person-level file for all individuals in each household and family respectively. Individuals under age 18 are also dropped from the dataset.

To produce the benchmarks used in this study, the following variables were extracted from the March 2018 CPS Public Use Microdata file (coding is noted in brackets if recodes were done):

Household-Level Variables

Region (4-level)
GEREG (REGION)

- | | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| 1 | Northeast |
| 2 | Midwest (Formerly North Central) |
| 3 | South |
| 4 | West |

Metropolitan Status
GTMETSTA (METROPOLITAN STATUS)

- | | |
|---|------------------|
| 1 | Metropolitan |
| 2 | Non-metropolitan |
| 3 | Not identified |

Total household income

HTOTVAL

Range: -\$389,961 to \$23,399,766

[This variable was recoded into 18 categories.]

Household size including children

H_NUMPER (TOTAL NUMBER OF PERSONS LIVING IN THE HOUSEHOLD
(HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS))

1-39 Persons in household

[This variable was recoded so that all values of 6 or more persons were collapsed into a single category.]

Person-Level Variables

Sex

A_SEX

- | | |
|---|--------|
| 1 | Male |
| 2 | Female |

Age

A_AGE

- | | |
|-------|--------------------|
| 00-79 | 0-79 Years of age |
| 80 | 80-84 Years of age |
| 81 | 85+ Years of age |

[This variable was recoded into 4 categories: 18-29, 30-44, 45-59, and 60+.]

Educational attainment

A_HGA

- 00 Children *[NA]*
- 31 Less than 1st grade *[No HS diploma]*
- 32 1st,2nd,3rd,or 4th grade *[No HS diploma]*
- 33 5th or 6th grade *[No HS diploma]*
- 34 7th and 8th grade *[No HS diploma]*
- 35 9th grade *[No HS diploma]*
- 36 10th grade *[No HS diploma]*
- 37 11th grade *[No HS diploma]*
- 38 12th grade no diploma *[No HS diploma]*
- 39 High school graduate – high school diploma or equivalent *[HS graduate or equivalent]*
- 40 Some college but no degree *[Some college]*
- 41 Associate degree in college - occupation/vocation program *[Some college]*
- 42 Associate degree in college - academic program *[Some college]*
- 43 Bachelor's degree (for example: BA,AB,BS) *[BA or above]*
- 44 Master's degree (for example: MA,MS,MENG,MED,MSW, MBA) *[BA or above]*
- 45 Professional school degree (for example: MD,DDS,DVM,LLB,JD) *[BA or above]*
- 46 Doctorate degree (for example: PHD,EDD) *[BA or above]*

Race

PRDTRACE

- 01 White only *[White]*
- 02 Black only *[Black]*
- 03 American Indian, Alaskan Native only (AI) *[Other]*
- 04 Asian only *[Asian/Pacific Islander]*
- 05 Hawaiian/Pacific Islander only (HP) *[Asian/Pacific Islander]*
- 06 White-Black *[Multiple]*
- 07 White-AI *[Multiple]*
- 08 White-Asian *[Multiple]*
- 09 White-HP *[Multiple]*
- 10 Black-AI *[Multiple]*
- 11 Black-Asian *[Multiple]*
- 12 Black-HP *[Multiple]*
- 13 AI-Asian *[Multiple]*
- 14 AI-HP *[Multiple]*
- 15 Asian-HP *[Asian/Pacific Islander]*
- 16 White-Black-AI *[Multiple]*
- 17 White-Black-Asian *[Multiple]*
- 18 White-Black-HP *[Multiple]*
- 19 White-AI-Asian *[Multiple]*

- 20 White-AI-HP *[Multiple]*
- 21 White-Asian-HP *[Multiple]*
- 22 Black-AI-Asian *[Multiple]*
- 23 White-Black-AI-Asian *[Multiple]*
- 24 White-AI-Asian-HP *[Multiple]*
- 25 Other 3 race comb. *[Multiple]*
- 26 Other 4 or 5 race comb. *[Multiple]*

Hispanic

PEHSPNON

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

Race/Ethnicity Recoding

Responses to the Race and Hispanic Ethnicity questions were combined such that respondents who reported that they were Hispanic were coded as Hispanic instead of their answer to the Race question. Those that were not identified as Hispanic were then coded as their racial category and Non-Hispanic.

Employment Status

PEMLR

- 1 Employed – at work *[Employed]*
- 2 Employed – absent *[Employed]*
- 3 Unemployed – on layoff *[Unemployed – on layoff]*
- 4 Unemployed – looking *[Unemployed – looking]*
- 5 Not in labor force – retired *[Retired]*
- 6 Not in labor force – disabled *[Disabled]*
- 7 Not in labor force – other *[Other]*

Class of Worker

PRCOW1

- 1 Federal government
- 2 State government

- 3 Local government
- 4 Private, for profit
- 5 Private, non-profit
- 6 Self-employed, incorporated
- 7 Self-employed, unincorporated
- 8 Without pay

Employment

Responses to the Employment Status and Class of Worker questions were combined such that respondents who were classified as Employed for Employment Status were divided into those who were self-employed (6 or 7 for Class of Worker) or paid employees (every other class).

Marital Status

A_MARITL

- 1 Married – civilian spouse [Married]
- 2 Married – AF spouse present [Married]
- 3 Married – spouse absent (exc. Separated) [Married]
- 4 Widowed
- 5 Divorced
- 6 Separated
- 7 Never married

American Community Survey (ACS)

The ACS is an ongoing survey that collects data on social, economic, housing, and demographic characteristics of household in the United States population. The United States Census Bureau randomly samples over 3.5 million addresses each year for the ACS. The Census Bureau sends household questionnaires to each randomly sampled address, along with instructions for completing an online version of the household questionnaire. Households that do not return the completed questionnaire by mail or complete the online version of the questionnaire within a few weeks are mailed an additional household questionnaire. Census

Bureau field representatives visit randomly selected addresses for which all mail contact attempts have not produced a completed household questionnaire, and addresses with post office box delivery addresses, who conduct in-person household interviews. The ACS also includes samples of people living in group quarters (e.g., dormitories and nursing homes). Finally, the Census Bureau contacts households by telephone to fill in incomplete questionnaires or clarify responses.

Each household member in the 2017 ACS is weighted to account for household and person factors. The household factors include: (1) probability of household selection; (2) interview mode subsampling; (3) variation in monthly response by interview mode; (4) unit non-response; (5) non-interview factor mode; (6) mode bias; and (7) geographic location. Person factors include: (1) regional population estimates; (2) householder and marital status; and (3) known population distributions of demographic characteristics.

The ACS publishes annual housing unit response rates at the national level. This response rate is based on all sampled addresses that have not been identified as non-existent or commercial, addresses not selected in the subsample for in-person follow-up interviews, and addresses not interviewed due to refusals or other reasons. The published housing unit response rate for the 2017 ACS is 93.7.²⁴

Data collected through the 2017 ACS were used to estimate housing tenure and housing type benchmarks. The questions in the 2017 ACS questionnaire used to estimate the benchmarks were:

Please answer the following questions about the house, apartment, or mobile home at the address on the mailing label.

²⁴ Available at: <https://www.census.gov/acs/www/methodology/sample-size-and-data-quality/response-rates/>

1. Which best describes this building? *Include all apartments, flats, etc., even if vacant.*
(variable: BLD)

1. A mobile home
2. A one-family house detached from any other house
3. A one-family house attached to one or more houses
4. A building with 2 apartments
5. A building with 3 or 4 apartments
6. A building with 5 to 9 apartments
7. A building with 10 to 19 apartments
8. A building with 20 to 49 apartments
9. A building with 50 or more apartments
10. Boat, RV, van, etc.

9. At this house, apartment, or mobile home – do you or any member of this household have access to the Internet? (variable: ACCESS)

1. Yes, by paying a cell phone company or Internet service provider
2. Yes, without paying a cell phone company or Internet service provider
3. No access to the Internet at this house, apartment, or mobile home

16. Is this house, apartment, or mobile home – *Mark (X) ONE box.* (variable: TEN)

1. Owned by you or someone in this household with a mortgage or loan? Include home equity loans.
2. Owned by you or someone in this household free and clear (without a mortgage or loan)?
3. Rented?
4. Occupied without payment of rent?

A housing tenure variable was created by combining all household members for whom answers to question #16 in the ACS was 1 or 2 into an “Owned or being bought” category. The housing tenure variable also included the original categories 3 and 4 in the ACS question #16. For the housing type variable, all household members for whom answers to ACS question #1 were 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, or 9 were collapsed into a single “Building with 2 or more apartments” category. No additional changes were made to the original categories in #1. For the Internet access variable, individuals who reported that they had Internet access at home (1 or 2) were coded as having access and those who did not (3) were coded as not having access. All persons

identified as 18 years of age or older were weighted using the person weights to produce the estimated housing tenure, Internet access and housing type benchmarks.

National Health Interview Survey (NHIS)

The NHIS is an annual cross-sectional household interview survey of the civilian noninstitutionalized United States population. Persons in long-term care institutions, correctional facilities, and U.S. nationals living in foreign countries are excluded from the survey. Households and non-institutional group quarters (e.g., college dormitories) are randomly sampled following a multi-stage area probability design that results in samples of units from every state and the District of Columbia. The NHIS is the principal source of information on the health of the civilian non-institutionalized population of the United States and is one of the major data collection programs of the National Center for Health Statistics.

The NHIS conducts interviews throughout the year. Randomly sampled households receive a mailed letter explaining the purpose of the NHIS and providing general information about NHIS interviews. The NHIS uses field interviewers to conduct in-person interviews of members of randomly sampled households. One household member who is at least the age of legal majority for the state of residence is identified as the “household respondent”, and the household respondent completes the Household Composition section of the questionnaire. One resident family member who is at least the age of legal majority is identified as the “family respondent”, and the family respondent completes a Family Core questionnaire on behalf of all family members living in the household. While NHIS field interviewers conduct other interviews with randomly selected household members, the benchmarks estimated from 2016 NHIS data came only from the family core questionnaire.

The 2017 NHIS public use microdata file contained information for 32,617 households containing 78,132 persons in 33,157 families. The NHIS reports the family level response rate for the 2017 NHIS, which reflects the number of families providing sufficient family level data in randomly selected and eligible households, at 65.7%. Of the randomly selected and eligible households, 23.7% refused to participate or failed to sufficiently complete an interview. Most of the remaining non-interviews were the result of failures to locate a household respondent after repeated contact attempts.²⁵

Each person in the 2017 NHIS is weighted to account for: (1) probability of household selection; (2) known population distributions of demographic characteristics.

Answers to three questions in the 2017 NHIS Family Core questionnaire were used to estimate the PHONESERVICE benchmarks. One question identified families with landline telephones in their households, another identified families with cell phones, and the third measured phone usage in families with landline and cell phones. The question wordings and response options to these questions are:

Landline service (CURWRK)

Is there at least one telephone INSIDE your home that is currently working and is not a cell phone?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 7 Refused
- 9 Don't know

Cell phone service (TELCEL)

Do you or anyone in your family have a working cell phone?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 7 Refused
- 9 Don't know

²⁵ Center for Disease Control and Prevention (2017). National Health Interview Survey: Survey Description. Available at: <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhis/data-questionnaires-documentation.htm>.

Phone usage (PHONEUSE)

Of all the telephone calls that you or your family receives, are...

- 1 All or almost all calls received on cell phones
- 2 Some received on cell phones and some on regular phones
- 3 Very few or none on cell phones
- 7 Refused
- 9 Don't know

The PHONESERVICE benchmarks were estimated by categorizing all family members for whom CURWRK=1 and TELCEL=2 as “Landline telephone only”, all family members for whom CURWRK=2 and TELCEL=1 as “Cellphone only”, and all family members for whom CURWRK=2 and TELCEL=2 as “No telephone”. For family members with landline and cell phone service, PHONESERVICE categories were based on answers to the PHONEUSE question (“Have a landline, but mostly use cellphone”; “Some received on cell phones and some on regular phones”; and, “Have cellphone, but mostly use landline”).

Weighting Procedure

To develop weights for the Amerispeak data, we followed the basic procedure outlined by a Blue-Ribbon panel convened by the American National Election Studies to generate their weighting procedure.²⁶ On a basic level, the weighting process involves (1) identifying a series of benchmarks for weighting, (2) correcting for known deviations from simple random sampling in the design by using a base weight, (3) running a raking (a.k.a. rim weighting or iterative proportional fitting) model to produce weights that lead the overall dataset to match the benchmarks that are most discrepant from those in the sample, (4) trimming any very large weights that emerge in the process, and (5) rerunning this procedure as necessary to ensure that no new sample values differ in problematic ways from the benchmarks. The approach proposed

²⁶ <https://www.electionstudies.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/nes012427.pdf>

by panel members is implemented in the *anesrake* software package for R, which conducts many the steps recommended by the Blue-Ribbon Panel in an automated manner, ensuring that arbitrary researcher decisions are not influencing the eventual results.

To produce the weights used for this study, twelve benchmark categories were considered: sex, Census region, metropolitan status, marital status, persons in household, age categories, educational attainment, home ownership, race/ethnicity, working status, housing type, and home internet access. The NHIS benchmarks for combining mobile phones and landlines were not used for this study for two reasons. First, the sampling procedure used for Amerispeak did not rely heavily on telephone interviewing, meaning that there was not a strong theoretical reason to expect that telephone status would matter for response propensities. Second, the categories for this variable did not match those in the Amerispeak data, meaning that the datasets would not be directly comparable (Amerispeak did not provide an option that people could use landlines and cellular phones at similar rates).

Whenever benchmarking categories included fewer than 5% of the U.S. population or when there were more than 6 categories for a benchmarking variable, we attempted to combine that variable with the most closely related categories until this was no longer an issue. When there were multiple equally acceptable combinations of response categories that could be used, we opted to combine smaller categories first to maximize the proportion of respondents across each of the benchmarking groups used. Hence, when we found that individuals who reported their marital status was “separated” constituted only 2.0% of the U.S. population, these individuals were combined with divorced respondents (who constituted 10.4% of the population) rather than married respondents (52.7%). The same decision rule led us to combine the racial categories “Asian/Pacific Islander” (6.3%), “Other race” (0.8%), and “Multiple races” (1.3%).

Respondents who reported their employment status as “on layoff” (0.4%) or “looking” (2.1%) were similarly combined with the “other not working” category (11.5%).

For most other variables, selections of six or fewer categories to use were made based on the fewest category classifications that were typically available. Hence, benchmarks were created for the four-category age and education sets that were provided as standard demographics by Amerispeak.

Finally, for variables where a single category was especially frequent related to the others, we created dichotomous benchmarks placing respondents either in the modal category or not. These included metropolitan status (86.5% of the population), home ownership (67.3% of the population owns their homes), and housing type (67.5% live in detached single-family homes).

Appendix E

Value Estimation Procedure

METHODOLOGY FOR ESTIMATING VALUE

Background

The framework for estimating mean value assumes that value has a distribution in the population, which we can represent with a random variable, W . We assume that value is nonnegative and allow for the possibility that some members of the population have zero value.

Because prices were randomly assigned to respondents, we can represent the prices assigned to an individual as a random variable, B , which is independent of W . In the current study, all prices are positive, so we take B to be a random variable with $B > 0$. Generally, B can be drawn from a continuous or discrete distribution.

We do not observe value directly. Rather, once a respondent was presented with a price, we observe whether he or she purchases the dog food. We describe this decision by a binary indicator, Y , where $Y = 1$ for means buy and $Y = 0$ means do not buy. We assume an individual chooses to buy if his or her underlying value exceeds the price. In other words,

$$\begin{aligned} Y &= 1 \text{ if } W > B \\ &= 0 \text{ if } W \leq B \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

We can write this using the indicator function $1[\cdot]$ as

$$Y = 1[W > B]. \tag{2}$$

The survival function of W plays a critical role in nonparametric estimation of (lower bound) mean value. The survivor function is defined as the probability that value exceeds any specified value, w :

$$S(w) = P(W > w) = 1 - F(w), \tag{3}$$

where $F(w)$ is the cumulative distribution function of W . Another way to interpret the survivor function is that $S(w)$ is the fraction of individuals in the population with value above the

specified value w .

When value is nonnegative, an important result from probability theory is that the mean value is the area under the survival function, written mathematically as

$$E(W) = \int_0^{\infty} S(w)dw \quad (4)$$

This expression is the basis for nonparametric estimation of mean value.

Nonparametric Estimation of the Survival Function

It is possible to estimate the survivor function without specifying a parametric family for the value distribution. In most applications, the number of offered prices is small, and we can only estimate the value survivor function at these prices. Suppose there are M prices, ordered from smallest to largest as $\{b_1, \dots, b_M\}$. Then we can obtain an unbiased and consistent estimator of the survivor function at these M values by obtaining the fraction of purchases made at each price. For price b_r , this estimator can be written as

$$\hat{S}(b_m) = N_m^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}[B_i = b_m] Y_i = \bar{Y}_m, \quad (5)$$

where N_m is the number of units given price value b_m and \bar{Y}_m is the fraction of purchases at price b_m . These estimates can be obtained all at once using multiple regression. For each i , define a set of price indicator variables:

$$B1_i = 1 \text{ if } B_i = b_1, 0 \text{ otherwise}$$

$$B2_i = 1 \text{ if } B_i = b_2, 0 \text{ otherwise}$$

\vdots

$$BM_i = 1 \text{ if } B_i = b_M, 0 \text{ otherwise}$$

These M dummy variables are mutually exclusive and exhaustive: one and only one of the dummy variables equals unity for each i , and the rest equal zero. Then the unbiased estimators of

the survivor function at the different prices are obtained as the coefficients from the multiple regression

$$Y_i \text{ on } B1_i, B2_i, \dots, BM_i, i = 1, \dots, N \quad (6)$$

This regression makes it convenient to obtain standard errors both for random samples and for samples obtained by various survey designs.

Estimating Mean Value Using the Lewbel-Watanabe Approach

Work by Lewbel (2000) and Watanabe (2010) on estimating mean value is based on the following simple expression:

$$E(W) = \int_0^\infty E(Y | B = b) db \quad (7)$$

From here, we can derive the equation at the heart of the L-W estimation approach. Let $g(b)$ denote the price (bid) density and assume that $g(b) > 0$ for all $b > 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty E(Y | B = b) db &= \int_0^\infty \frac{E(Y | B = b)}{g(b)} g(b) db = E \left[\frac{E(Y | B)}{g(B)} \right] \\ &= E \left[E \left(\frac{Y}{g(B)} \middle| B \right) \right] = E \left[\frac{Y}{g(B)} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where the last equality holds by the law of iterated expectations. We can summarize the equation that is the basis for the Lewbel-Watanabe approach:

$$E(W) = E \left[\frac{Y}{g(B)} \right] \quad (9)$$

This is the key equation. We would like to estimate $E(W)$ but we do not observe W . Instead, we can obtain data on price and purchase decisions, (B, Y) . If we know, or can estimate, the price density $g(b)$, then we can use a sample average of the weighted purchase decisions, $Y_i / g(B_i)$.

This is the focus of Watanabe (2010) and a special case of Lewbel (2000) (although Lewbel was not focusing on mean value).

Issues Concerning the Support of the Value and Price Distributions

The equality in Equation (9) assumes that the offered price distribution is unbounded, which is rarely if ever true. Usually, an upper bound is placed on the prices. Let \bar{B} be the upper bound of the price distribution and let \bar{W} be the largest value (if there is a maximum value). If $\bar{W} \leq \bar{B}$ then equation (9) continues to hold because $S(w) = 0$ for $w \geq \bar{W}$:

$$E(W) = \int_0^{\bar{W}} S(b)db = \int_0^{\bar{B}} S(b)db = \int_0^{\bar{B}} E(Y | B = b)db \quad (10)$$

and then the argument is the same as before. The assumption $\bar{W} \leq \bar{B}$ is used in the theoretical work of Lewbel (2000) and Watanabe (2010).

In practice, it is more likely that the upper bound of the price distribution is below the maximum value in the population, that is, $\bar{B} < \bar{W}$. In such cases the L-W expected value is below the actual mean value:

$$E(W) = \int_0^{\bar{W}} S(b)db \geq \int_0^{\bar{B}} S(b)db = \int_0^{\bar{B}} E(Y | B = b)db = E\left[\frac{Y}{g(B)}\right]. \quad (11)$$

Therefore, we have the following important conclusion: Provided the price density satisfies $g(b) > 0$ for all $0 < b \leq \bar{B}$,

$$E(W) \geq E\left[\frac{Y}{g(B)}\right]. \quad (12)$$

We can estimate the expected value of $Y / g(B)$, so if we were to use a continuous price design, the quantity that can be estimated is a lower bound for $E(W)$.

Lewbel-Watanabe for Discrete Price Distributions

In the vast majority of studies of this sort, prices are drawn from a discrete set of values; often a small set. What can we say about the L-W estimator if the distribution of B is discrete and

takes on the values $\{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_M\}$? The answer is that we can apply the L-W approach using a piecewise-uniform price distribution and obtain conservative estimates.

The argument requires a simple thought experiment. Let B^* be the price if it were drawn from a piecewise uniform price distribution with jumps at the set prices. Define the (counterfactual) outcome:

$$Y^* = 1[W > B^*], \quad (13)$$

so Y^* is the result of the vote if the price distribution were represented by B^* . We can think of B as being the maximum price over the interval that B^* falls into.

Here is what we know:

1. $B \geq B^*$ by construction. It follows that

$$Y = 1[W > B] \leq 1[W > B^*] = Y^*, \quad (14)$$

which simply says that if the respondent purchases the product at B , he or she would also purchase it at a smaller price, B^* .

2. Let $h(\cdot)$ denote the piecewise uniform density of B^* . Then $h(B) = h(B^*)$ by construction.

Using this fact and $Y \leq Y^*$:

$$\frac{Y}{h(B)} = \frac{Y}{h(B^*)} \leq \frac{Y^*}{h(B^*)} \quad (15)$$

Taken together, the above two points establish the following key result:

$$E\left[\frac{Y}{h(B)}\right] \leq E\left[\frac{Y^*}{h(B^*)}\right] \leq E(W), \quad (16)$$

where the second inequality follows from our previous analysis. This equation means that we can act as if we have a piecewise-uniform price distribution in order to satisfy the requirement $h(b) > 0$ on $(0, \bar{B})$ where $\bar{B} = b_M$ in this case. Now we can apply Lewbel-Watanabe directly.

Lewbel-Watanabe with Covariates

One of the attractive features of the Lewbel-Watanabe approach is that it can be applied to the case where value is modeled as a function of covariates – in particular, the number of corrective statements, attitude variables, and demographic variables.

Mathematically, we would like to estimate the conditional expectation, $E(W | X)$, where X is the vector of covariates. The key extension is that if price B is independent of (W, X) then

$$E\left[\frac{Y}{g(B)} \middle| X\right] = E(W | X), \quad (17)$$

where $g(\cdot) > 0$ is the price density. As in the case of the unconditional mean, equality here requires the support of the value distribution to be contained in that of the price distribution. If not, $E(W | X)$ is at least as large as the expression on the left-hand side.

Lewbel (2000) and Watanabe (2010) used linear models for $E(W|X)$, but this is not necessarily the best choice because we are imposing $W \geq 0$. An exponential model is attractive because it ensures nonnegativity and applies even if W has a spike at zero. Specifically,

$$E(W|X) = \exp(\alpha + X\beta). \quad (18)$$

The exponential model gives a natural way to estimate a constant elasticity by including the logarithm of explanatory variables in X .

Just as importantly, coefficients on other variables have percentage change interpretations. For example, if X_1 is the number of corrective statements, its coefficient, β_1 when multiplied by 100, gives the approximate percentage change in mean value for each additional corrective statement. Therefore, the exponential function provides a particularly simple way to allow imposing the restriction that the number of corrective statements has the same *percentage* effect on mean value, as opposed to the same dollar effect (as would occur in a

linear model).

For large changes in a variable – for example, increasing the number of messages or corrective statements from its lowest value, zero, to its largest value, eight, one can compute the exact percentage change as 100 times the quantity $\exp(8\beta_1) - 1$, using the fact that $\exp(0) = 1$.

A convenient estimator for exponential regression models is the Poisson quasi-MLE. As discussed by Wooldridge (2010, Chapter 18), the Poisson QMLE is fully robust in the sense that only the mean function needs to be correctly specified. The Poisson distribution can be otherwise arbitrarily misspecified. Robust standard errors are computed routinely by commonly used statistical packages, such as Stata. After the Poisson estimation, one can estimate the proportionate change in value, $\exp(8\beta_1) - 1$, as $\exp(8\hat{\beta}_1) - 1$, and compute an asymptotic standard error. In Stata, this is easily done using the “nlcom” command.

Another nice feature of the Poisson QMLE is that using covariates to estimate a conditional mean gives the same estimate of the lower-bound unconditional mean value as the LW estimator without covariates. More precisely, if we define the weighted vote as

$$R_i = \frac{Y_i}{\hat{g}(B_i)} \quad (19)$$

then

$$\bar{R} = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \exp(\hat{\alpha} + X_i \hat{\beta}). \quad (20)$$

Calculating Standard Errors with Covariates

When covariates are included in the predictive equation, the LW estimator that uses the realized price distribution is a two-step estimator. The price distribution is estimated in the first step, and then regression parameters are estimated in a second step. As described by Wooldridge (2007), the use of the estimated price distribution rather than the population price distribution

enhances the efficiency of the L-W procedure. See also Section 13.10.2 in Wooldridge (2010), which also describes how to obtain the standard errors that account for estimation of the price density $g(b)$.

References

- Lewbel, A. (2000). Semiparametric Qualitative Response Model Estimation with Unknown Heteroscedasticity or Instrumental Variables. *Journal of Econometrics*, 97, 145-177.
- Wooldridge, J.M. (2007). Inverse Probability Weighted M-Estimation for General Missing Data Problems. *Journal of Econometrics*, 141, 1281-1301.
- Wooldridge, J.M. (2010), *Econometric Analysis of Cross Section and Panel Data* (2nd ed.) Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

FIRST REPORT – FIRST REPORT – Part 2

of

Dr. Jon A. Krosnick
Stanford University
432 McClatchy Hall
450 Serra Street
Stanford, California 94305

on

August 13, 2019

Scott Weaver, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, Plaintiff, v. Champion Petfoods USA, Inc. and Champion Petfoods LP, Defendants. United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, Case No. 2:18-cv-01996-JPS.

I. Introduction and Background of Opinion

1. I am the Frederic O. Glover Professor of Humanities and Social Sciences and a Professor of Communication, Political Science, and (by courtesy) Psychology at Stanford University in Stanford, California, a Research Psychologist at the U.S. Census Bureau, and a Research Advisor of the Gallup Organization.

2. I have written this report to offer an opinion about how providing information about one particular alleged contaminant of Champion dog foods to supplement information on packages affects consumers' perceptions of the quality of the product.

3. A recent full curriculum vitae is attached to this declaration as Appendix A. In paragraphs 4-9 below, I summarize some important aspects of my qualifications and background.

4. I received an A.B. degree in psychology from Harvard University and M.A. and Ph.D. degrees in social psychology from the University of Michigan. As a part of my undergraduate and graduate studies, I received extensive training in social psychology, survey and experimental research techniques, statistical data analysis, and political science.

5. From 1986 to 2004, I was a member of the faculties in Psychology and Political Science at The Ohio State University. My position there involved teaching classroom courses for undergraduates and graduate students, as well as one-on-one training of graduate students in research methods. Since 2004, I have done similar work at Stanford University.

6. My research has been recognized by the Erik H. Erikson Early Career Award, by election as a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, by election as a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, by two fellowships at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, and by election as a Fellow by the American Psychological Association, the American Psychological Society, and the Society for Personality

and Social Psychology. I was awarded the Nevitt Sanford Award from the International Society of Political Psychology. And I was awarded the lifetime career achievement award from the American Association for Public Opinion Research, the world's leading professional organization of survey researchers.

7. I have authored or co-authored seven published books and two forthcoming, more than 160 articles published or in press in journals or edited books, over 250 research presentations at professional conferences, and more than 250 invited addresses at universities and to government agencies, businesses, and in other settings. My journal articles have been selected by editors for reprinting in edited books more than 15 times. My journal articles have appeared in top-ranked journals in social psychology (Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Journal of Experimental Social Psychology), political science (American Political Science Review, American Journal of Political Science), survey research methods (Public Opinion Quarterly), and sociology (American Sociological Review, American Journal of Sociology).

8. Much of my research has focused on survey research methods, including how best to measure behavior and opinions through surveys, and almost all of my research has involved collection and analysis of survey data.

9. There are several other indicators of my competence as an expert on social science research methods. First, I have served on the editorial board of the most prestigious journals in social psychology (Journal of Personality and Social Psychology) and in survey research methods (Public Opinion Quarterly). Second, I regularly serve as a reviewer for other journals, publishers, and professional organizations. Third, I have received more than 100 grants to support my research. Fourth, I have served on the Board of Overseers of the General Social Survey and was co-Principal Investigator of the American National Election Studies, which are

the nation's leading academic survey research projects studying the public's opinions and behaviors. Fifth, I have been teaching research methodology since the early 1980s and have been invited to give lectures and teach courses on research methodology to the research staffs of federal agencies in Washington, D.C., and at many professional organizations and universities around the U.S., as well as in the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, South Africa, Canada, and elsewhere.

10. To complete my assignment in this case, I reviewed case-specific documents supplied to me by Plaintiffs' counsel, including:

- The Third Amended Class Action Complaint
- The Second Amended Class Action Complaint
- Champion Declaration re Class Cert- WI case.pdf
- Champion Milam Declaration re Class Cert- Wi Case.pdf
- Champion Rebuttal Expert Report- WI case.pdf
- Code of Federal Regs.pdf
- CPF0001136.pdf
- CPF0057656.pdf
- CPF1973651.pdf
- CPF2070652.pdf
- CPF2117026.pdf
- CPF2117031-CPF2117039.pdf
- CPF2117040-CPF2117048.pdf
- D Colo – Jerding and Renfro v. Champion.pdf
- D Iowa – Blackburn v. Champion.pdf
- D Mass – Slawsby v. Champion.pdf
- D Minn – Song and Wertkin v. Champion.pdf
- Damages Expert Rpt.- WI case.pdf
- DM-#534873-v8-Second_Amended-Complain_-
_Illinois_Champion_Dog_Food.pdf
- Label Expert Rpt.- WI case.pdf;
- Dog Food Testing.pdf
- ED Mich – Shaker v. Champion.pdf
- ED Wis – Weaver v Champion (redacted).pdf
- ND Ill – Zarinebaf and Chernik v. Champion.pdf
- NDNY – Colangelo v. Champion.pdf
- WD Wash – Rydman v. Champion.pdf
- Numerous Champion marketing materials and internal reports

11. I also drew upon my pre-existing knowledge of the literatures on survey research methods and related fields. I oversaw the design and conduct of an experiment embedded in a survey conducted with a nationally representative sample of American adults.

12. Based upon my prior experience and my work done on this matter, I have reached the conclusion, based on a survey that I conducted, that providing information to consumers about an alleged contaminant in Champion dog foods (pentobarbital) decreased the apparent quality and healthiness of Champion dog foods. I outline the details of all this below.

13. My comments below are organized in the following manner. I begin by explaining the logic and theory underlying survey research methods and the principles that justify generalizing from a systematically selected sample of people to the full population from which they are drawn. Then I review the uses of surveys in court and the valuable roles that surveys can play in litigation generally and in this case in particular. Next, I review the procedures that I implemented to conduct a survey in this case, and I describe the results of that survey. Details of the methodology and results of the survey that I conducted are provided in the Technical Report in this document.

Survey Research Methods

14. Survey research is a well-established and solidly respected scientific approach to measuring the behavior, attitudes, and beliefs of populations of individuals (Babbie, E.R. 1990. Survey Research Methods. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth; Weisberg, H, Krosnick, J. A., & Bowen, B. 1996. An Introduction to Survey Research, Polling, and Data Analysis. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage). Conducting a survey research study involves three principal phases: (1) drawing a sample of respondents to represent a population, (2) collecting data from those respondents, and (3) analyzing the data generated to answer the questions of interest. Surveys are usually done for

one or both of two reasons: (1) to document the prevalence of some characteristic in a population, and/or (2) to document causal processes that produce behaviors, beliefs, or attitudes.

15. Survey research dates back at least to the 19th century, but the most significant developments and improvements in the method took place during the first half of the 20th century. During that time, researchers came to recognize that the method by which respondents are selected from a population can introduce substantial error to measurements if done improperly. Therefore, research on survey sampling has burgeoned during the last fifty years, and the result of this work is an excellent understanding of effective methods for drawing representative samples of populations. And the centerpiece of high quality, scientific survey research is random selection.

16. Although the word “random” has taken on the meaning “non-systematic” or “arbitrary” in contemporary informal, everyday conversations, the technical, scientific meaning of this term is anything but arbitrary. “Random” has a very specific, technical, and non-arbitrary definition in science, and randomization is one of the most valuable scientific tools, because it allows researchers to reach two sorts of conclusions. In one of its forms, random selection from a population is accomplished by using a method to select a subset of the population such that each member of the population has a known, non-zero probability of being chosen. For example, this can be done by flipping an unbiased coin over and over again, with each observation of heads or tails determining whether the next person on a list of population members should be chosen for study or omitted.

17. Randomization has also been employed in thousands of scientific experiments. Consider, for example, randomized clinical trials in which a researcher wishes to determine whether a drug helps people suffering from an affliction. In particular, consider a researcher who wishes to learn

whether an analgesic reduces pain from headaches. The researcher could give the drug to a group of people who report often suffering from headaches and, a month later, could ask those people whether their headache pain has been less than it was before they were given the drug. But if the month began at the beginning of April, and many of the headaches people experienced during that time were due to allergic reactions to pollen released by newly-blooming plants and flowers at the beginning of April, then people may report less pain not as the result of taking the drug but instead because of the disappearance of the stimulating pollen mid-month.

18. To avoid this artifact, the researcher can compare reports of headache pain from a group of people given the drug with reports of headache pain from a group of people not given the drug. But imagine that the researcher collected data from the first group of people by giving them the drug at the beginning of April and measuring headache pain at the end of April, and the researcher collected data from people not given the drug by asking about their headache pain during the month of May. Again, the difference between these two groups could be because less pollen in May caused headaches then to be less painful.

19. This ambiguity can be eliminated by random assignment. This randomization would again be done using a truly random device. Let us assume that flipping a coin is a truly random process, meaning that each time the coin is flipped, there is a 50% chance that it will fall with the heads side up, and a 50% chance that it will fall with the tails side up, and that the result of any given coin flip cannot be predicted in any way. If we begin with a group of people who agree to participate in an experiment on analgesics and flip a coin for each of those people, we can separate them into two groups (one whose coins land heads up, and the other whose coins land tails up) that are essentially identical to one another in every regard: the percent of men, the percent of women, the percent of old people, the percent of young people, the percent who have

graduated from college, the percent with red hair, and on and on. Every attribute will be present in almost exactly the same amount in the two groups.

20. If one of those groups is then given the analgesic to use when experiencing headaches in April, and the other group is not given the analgesic to use during the same time period, the difference between the two groups in their reports of headache pain will be attributable to the impact of the drug (if a statistical test indicates that that difference had a small probability of occurring by chance alone). This reasoning is only possible because participants were randomly assigned to the two groups. Randomization in this sense eliminates all artifacts.

21. But imagine that the people who participated in the experiment on headache pain were all 18-year-old men. Do the results of the study apply to 18-year-old women as well? Or to older men and women? There is no way to know, so a researcher who studies only 18-year-old men has no legitimate scientific basis to claim that the obtained study results show that the drug helps adults generally. Fortunately, randomization can be used in a second way to eliminate this ambiguity. The participants in a study can be randomly selected from the population of interest, and the results can then legitimately be viewed as descriptive of the population.

22. This can again be accomplished using a randomizing device. In the Netherlands, for example, the government maintains a “register” listing every person living in that country, and the register can be used by researchers to select a random sample of the population. You can imagine this process being done using a randomizing device such as the coin I described earlier. Imagine that for each person in the register, a researcher flips a coin, removes individuals from the list whose coin lands with heads facing up, and retains individuals whose coin lands with tails facing up. After this has been done once, about half of the people in the register will remain. If the same coin flipping procedure is implemented again among the retained individuals, about

one quarter of the original register will remain. And this can be done over and over in order to obtain a random sample of a relatively small size (say 1,000 people out of a population of millions). This is called “simple random sampling.”

23. If random sampling from the population is not implemented, there is no scientific basis to justify generalizing the results of a study from a group of participants to any larger population of people. According to William Barber (Barber, W. G., 2011. The universe. In Diamond S. S., & Swann, J. B. 2011. Trademark and deceptive advertising surveys: Law, science, and design. Chicago, IL: American Bar Association), random sampling “produces the most statistically reliable results” (p. 47).

24. If simple random sampling is done, statistical principles permit precise documentation of the uncertainty associated with the sample in generalizing to the population due to what is called “sampling error.” For example, if a researcher is interested in gauging the percentage of a company's employees who smoked five or more cigarettes each day during January, 2000, he or she could draw a simple random sample of size N from the population of all employees and interview each interviewed sample member, asking whether he or she smoked five or more cigarettes each day during January, 2000.

25. Imagine that a proportion p (somewhere between 0% and 100%) of the respondents report having done so. If the only error in this measurement is due to simple random sampling error, and if the study were to be repeated exactly the same way 100 times, in 95 percent of those times, the observed proportion of smokers would be within the “confidence interval” around the observed proportion p, that is between (p-SE) and (p+SE), where:

$$SE = \pm 1.96\sqrt{p(1-p)/(N-1)}$$

As the size of the sample approaches the size of the total population, SE gets a bit smaller than the formula above suggests. But most survey samples are much smaller than their relevant populations, so the formula offered above accurately describes the sampling error involved.

26. For example, if 38% of 1,000 survey respondents said that their favorite color was blue, the sampling error of that proportion is:

$$SE = \pm 1.96 \sqrt{.38(1 - .38)/(1,000 - 1)}$$

27. This means that if the study were repeated 100 times, in 95 of them, the observed proportion of people saying blue was their favorite color would fall between 35% (38% - 3%) and 41% (38% + 3%). This is based on the fact that the sample of 1,000 respondents was selected by simple random sampling. It is also possible to compute confidence intervals differently if more complex approaches to random sampling are implemented.

28. The response rate for a survey is the proportion of members of the selected sample from whom data are in fact collected. In almost all surveys, the response rate is less than 100%. A low response rate does not guarantee the presence of non-response bias. It is possible to conduct a survey with a response rate of 20% and end up with data from the participating sample that closely mirrors the population.

29. An accumulating number of publications show that as long as a representative sample is scientifically drawn from the population and thorough, professional efforts are made to collect data from all selected potential respondents, variation in response rates is generally not associated with notable changes in the accuracy of the survey's results (Curtin, R., Presser, S., & Singer, E. 2000. The effects of response rate changes on the index of consumer sentiment. Public Opinion Quarterly, 64, 413-428; Holbrook, A. L., Krosnick, J. A., & Pfent, A. M., 2008. The causes and consequences of response rates in surveys by the news media and government

contractor survey research firms. In J. M. Lepkowski, C. Tucker, J. M. Brick, E. D. de Leeuw, L. Japec, P. J. Lavrakas, M. W. Link, & R. L. Sangster (Eds.), Advances in Telephone Survey Methodology. New York: Wiley; Keeter, S., Miller, C., Kohut, A., Groves, R. M., & Presser, S. 2000. Consequences of reducing nonresponse in a national telephone survey. Public Opinion Quarterly, 64, 125-148; Merkle, D., & Edelman, M. 2002. Nonresponse in exit polls: A comprehensive analysis. In R. M. Groves, D. A. Dillman, J. L. Eltinge, & R. J. A. Little (Eds.), Survey Nonresponse, pp. 243–58. New York: Wiley).

30. A key factor that determines the accuracy of a survey is its questionnaire. Survey research is premised upon the notion that all respondents should be asked the same questions in the same way. The wordings of questions are typically specified through an extensive design process. Questions are drafted based upon a set of principles that seek to achieve comprehensibility, uniform understanding across respondents, and the absence of forces biasing respondents toward any given answer. A huge literature of thousands of scientific studies now exists identifying these principles and guiding researchers in how best to word questions to achieve these goals.

31. Survey research findings are used widely by government agencies, businesses, and in academic research. For example, whereas survey data appeared in articles in top journals in political science, economics, social psychology, and sociology in 1949 at a rate of 3%, 6%, 22%, and 24%, respectively, these figures increased by 1994 to 42%, 42%, 50%, and 70%, respectively (Presser, S. 1984. The use of survey data in basic research in the social sciences. In C. F. Turner and E. Martin (Eds.), Surveying Subjective Phenomena. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; Saris, W. E., Gallhofer, I., van der Veld, W., & Corten, I. 2003. A Scientific Method for Questionnaire Design: SQP. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam).

32. Decades of research have shown that the reliability and validity of survey data collected optimally are generally quite high, and that respondents can be relied upon to provide quite accurate descriptions of their past experiences, behaviors, and opinions. Most visibly, scientific surveys conducted according to best practices just before U.S. presidential elections predict post-election government reports of the actual election voting results very closely (see, e.g., Visser, P. S., Krosnick, J. A., Marquette, J., & Curtin, M. 1996. Mail surveys for election forecasting? An evaluation of the Columbus Dispatch poll. Public Opinion Quarterly, 60, 181-227; Visser, P. S., Krosnick, J. A., Marquette, J., & Curtin, M. 2000. Improving election forecasting: Allocation of undecided respondents, identification of likely voters, and response order effects. In P. Lavrakas & M. Traugott (Eds.), Election Polls, the News Media, and Democracy. New York, NY: Chatham House). For example, for decades beginning in 1936, the percent of votes won by the winner has correlated with the Gallup Poll's pre-election prediction of that percentage .85, a nearly perfect association.²⁷ Likewise, for decades beginning in 1948, the American National Election Study surveys' post-election measurements of the proportions of votes won by the winning presidential candidate have correlated with official government vote counts .92, again nearly perfect.

33. A high level of accuracy can be achieved if a survey is conducted using optimal procedures, including drawing a representative sample of the population, taking extensive steps to collect data from as many sampled people as possible, optimizing the choice of survey mode to achieve accurate measurements, asking questions that are easily comprehensible and do not

²⁷ Correlations can range from 1 (meaning a perfect match between the variables) to 0 (meaning a relation between the variables no better than chance) to -1 (meaning a perfect inverse relation between the variables).

entail biased wording or format, weighting results to correct for unequal sampling probabilities and unequal non-response, and much more.

Uses of Surveys in Court

34. Surveys have been admitted routinely in court as evidence suitable for use by an expert to form an opinion. Diamond (2000) provided a history of the uses of surveys in court in her chapter, Reference Guide on Survey Research (2nd edition). In Reference Manual on Scientific Evidence. Washington, D.C.: Federal Judicial Center, 229-276), she wrote:

“Forty years ago, the question whether surveys constituted acceptable evidence still was unsettled. Early doubts about the admissibility of surveys centered on their use of sampling techniques and their status as hearsay evidence. Federal Rule of Evidence 703 settled both matters for survey by redirecting attention to the “validity of the techniques employed.” The inquiry under Rule 703 focuses on whether facts or data are “of a type reasonably relied upon by experts in the particular field in forming opinions or inferences upon the subject.” For a survey, the question becomes, “Was the poll or survey conducted in accordance with generally accepted survey principles, and were the results used in a statistically correct way?”

“Because the survey method provides an economical and systematic way to gather information about a large number of individuals or social units, surveys are used widely in business, government, and, increasingly, administrative settings and judicial proceedings. Both federal and state courts have accepted survey evidence on a variety of issues. ... Surveys of employees or prospective employees are used to support or refute claims of employment discrimination. ...Requests for a change of venue on grounds of jury pool bias often are backed by evidence from a survey of jury-eligible respondents in

the area of the original venue. ... A routine use of surveys in federal courts occurs in Lanham Act cases, where the plaintiff alleges trademark infringement or claims that false advertising has confused or deceived consumers. The pivotal legal question in such cases virtually demands survey research because it centers on consumer perception (i.e., is the consumer likely to be confused about the source of a product, or does the advertisement imply an inaccurate message?). In addition, survey methodology has been used creatively to assist federal courts in managing mass torts litigation. Faced with the prospect of conducting discovery concerning 10,000 plaintiffs, the plaintiffs and defendants in *Wilhoite v. Olin Corp.* jointly drafted a discovery survey that was administered in person by neutral third parties, thus replacing interrogatories and depositions. It resulted in substantial savings in both time and cost. (Diamond, 2000, p. 233-235)."

35. The value of surveys in court was affirmed by Jay and Levine (2005; *Litigation surveys*. In S. J. Best and B. Radcliff (Eds.), Polling America: An encyclopedia of public opinion. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press):

"Litigation surveys benefit the legal process by providing information on disputed issues that could not feasibly be presented in court through conventional means. In class action lawsuits, mass torts litigation, or other court cases involving numerous plaintiffs who are potential witnesses, survey evidence presented by a single witness effectively can substitute for the testimony of hundreds, even thousands. This can shorten the litigation process, reduce litigation costs, and ease court congestion. Moreover, survey evidence derived from a representative sample of a large class of potential witnesses may in fact prove more reliable than the testimony of a few individuals selected from that class, since a few handpicked witnesses may not be truly representative of the whole. A

clear preference for survey evidence in appropriate cases has been expressed by the federal judiciary through litigation reference materials published by the Federal Judicial Center (Jay & Levine 2003, p. 433).”

36. These characterizations of the value of surveys in court are directly applicable to the present case. Rather than spending the time and money necessary to collect information about experiences from an entire group of people through direct testimony, a survey can be conducted to efficiently collect scientifically projectable results that will describe a population of interest within a specifiable margin of error.

37. Survey research methodology is now a solid science, with widely agreed-upon principles of optimal design for sampling, questionnaire construction, data collection, and data analysis. Experts in this field, including myself, routinely belong to and attend annual conferences sponsored by professional associations such as the American Association for Public Opinion Research and subscribe to journals such as Public Opinion Quarterly, the Journal of Official Statistics, the International Journal of Public Opinion Research, and other such periodicals to track the latest advances in survey methodology.

Design of the Second Champion Survey

38. Thus far, I have offered reasons to believe that a survey can be done efficiently and can accurately inform the Court about people’s perceptions of consumer products. To conduct a survey for this case, a series of methodological choices had to be made, and I outline these choices below, along with considerations that influenced how such choices were made in this investigation.

39. One choice involves the mode of data collection. Many survey researchers believe that the highest response rates and most accurate measurements can be achieved if respondents are

contacted face-to-face at their homes and are interviewed in person, and empirical evidence supports this belief (see, e.g., Holbrook, A. L., Green, M. C., & Krosnick, J. A. 2003. Telephone vs. face-to-face interviewing of national probability samples with long questionnaires:

Comparisons of respondent satisficing and social desirability response bias. Public Opinion Quarterly, 67, 79-125). This method is extremely time-consuming and expensive and is used only in the highest visibility surveys done by the federal government and academic researchers. Much more common and cost-effective are surveys conducted by telephone, paper-and-pencil questionnaires, or questionnaires administered via the Internet.

40. When choosing among these three survey modes, it is important to consider the accuracy of the measurements obtained. First, consider the choice between telephone interviewing and a paper questionnaire. Dozens of published studies have compared information collected via telephone interviews with comparable information collected via paper questionnaires. Unfortunately, most of these studies involved design flaws (e.g., non-random assignment of individuals to survey modes, cross-over designs wherein the same respondent provides data in multiple modes, the use of different questionnaires in the different modes) that preclude reaching clear conclusions about differences between the modes in terms of results. And almost none of these studies reported any analyses comparing the validity of the measurements obtained via the two modes.

41. One study that made such a comparison and is especially relevant to the present case was conducted by Silver and myself (Silver, M. D., & Krosnick, J. A. 2001. An experimental comparison of the quality of data obtained in telephone and self-administered mailed surveys with a listed sample. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Montreal, Canada). In this study, each member of a representative sample of

commercial airline pilots was randomly assigned to be interviewed either by telephone or to complete paper questionnaires. Respondents were asked to report the number of times they had witnessed various types of safety-related events while working in the cockpit of a commercial airliner during a specific period of time. Respondents were randomly assigned to one of various lengths of recall periods, ranging from one week to six months. If respondents reported event frequencies accurately, then there should be a linear relation between the number of days in the recall period and the number of safety-related events reported, mediated by the number of hours flown in the recall period by each pilot. That is, the longer a pilot's assigned recall period, the more hours he should have flown, and the more hours a pilot flew, the more safety-related events he or she should have witnessed. The more measurement error was contained in answers to the event frequency questions, the weaker the relation between these variables would have been. Therefore, the strength of this statistical relation can be viewed as a measure of the validity of the reports provided.

42. Silver and Krosnick (2001) found the relation between hours flown and number of events reported to be 20% stronger among respondents interviewed by telephone than among respondents who completed paper and pencil questionnaires, a statistically significant difference. Furthermore, the telephone respondents expressed significantly greater confidence in the accuracy of their event reports. The higher accuracy and confidence seem to be attributable to the fact that the paper questionnaire respondents rushed through the process of answering, spending only 13 minutes on average completing the questionnaire, as compared to the 19 minutes on average spent by respondents interviewed by telephone, a statistically significant difference. This set of results suggests caution about employing paper questionnaires to collect data for the current case.

43. The third standard mode that could be employed is questionnaire administration via computers and the Internet. It is possible to conduct Internet surveys of scientific, representative, samples of members of a population if these individuals have been selected truly randomly from the population of interest and recruited to join a long-term panel and to complete questionnaires regularly (e.g., every week or two). This method has proven to yield results that are generally as accurate as, or more accurate than, the results yielded by comparable telephone surveys of the same population (see, e.g., Chang, L., & Krosnick, J. A. 2009. National surveys via RDD telephone interviewing vs. the Internet: Comparing sample representativeness and response quality. Public Opinion Quarterly, 73, 641-678; Chang, L., & Krosnick, J. A. 2010. Comparing oral interviewing with self-administered computerized questionnaires: An experiment. Public Opinion Quarterly, 74, 154-167; MacInnis, B., Krosnick, J. A., Ho, A. S., & Cho, M-J. 2018. The accuracy of measurements with probability survey samples: Replication and extension. Public Opinion Quarterly, 82, 707-744; Pasek, J. 2015. When will nonprobability surveys mirror probability surveys? Considering types of inference and weighting strategies as criteria for correspondence. International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 28, 269-291; Yeager, D. S., Krosnick, J. A., Chang, L., Javitz, H. S., Levendusky, M. S., Simpser, A., & Wang, R. 2011. Comparing the accuracy of RDD telephone surveys and Internet surveys conducted with probability and non-probability samples. Public Opinion Quarterly, 75, 709-747). Because of this track record, I chose Internet data collection for this survey.²⁸

²⁸ The vast majority of Internet surveys done these days are not done with random, representative samples who are systematically selected from a well-defined population, all of whom have a known, non-zero probability of selection. Instead, these surveys are done with people who were not systematically sampled and instead volunteered to complete questionnaires to make money in response to banner ads on websites, email invitations sent to non-representative groups of people (e.g., members of the United Airlines frequent flier club), and other such recruitment methods that do not involve random sampling from any population. There is no scientific justification for

Procedure for Implementing the Second Champion Survey

44. In order to implement a survey in this case, the following sequence of events was executed (for details, see the Technical Report in this document). First, I designed a questionnaire that displayed packaging of one Acana product or one Orijen product and asked questions that assessed perceptions of the quality and healthiness of the products, in addition to a variety of questions about people's experiences owning dogs. Each respondent saw one package and answered questions about that product.

45. The questionnaire was then administered to a large, nationally representative sample of American adults ages 18 years old and older by the USC Dornsife Center for Economic and Social Research (USC CESR), a well-established and highly respected survey research organization with extensive experience in collecting survey data via the internet.

Evaluation of the Survey in Light of Criteria Articulated by Dr. Shari Diamond

46. Dr. Shari Diamond, Professor at Northwestern University, has written an authoritative text on the uses of surveys in court, and she provided guidelines for evaluating survey evidence and principles to guide survey design in order to yield reliable data. In the most recent edition of that chapter, Dr. Diamond listed a series of questions that should be asked about any survey evidence that is submitted for a court's consideration (Diamond, S.S. 2011. Reference Guide on Survey Research. In The Federal Judicial Center and National Research Council of the National Academies Reference Manual on Scientific Evidence, Third Edition). Next, I address each of these questions (listed as headers in italics) with regard to the survey conducted in this case.

the claim that such samples describe populations of interest, and such samples routinely produce results that are considerably less accurate than those yielded by truly random samples.

Was the Survey Designed to Address Relevant Questions?

47. The survey was designed to address this question of interest:

- How did learning about the risk of the possible presence of a non-natural substance (pentobarbital) impact consumers' perceptions of the quality and healthiness of the dog foods?

Was Participation in the Design, Administration, and Interpretation of the Survey

Appropriately Controlled to Ensure the Objectivity of the Survey?

48. I designed the survey and interpreted the obtained data. In doing so, I worked with employees of The Strategy Team. These individuals took all necessary steps to ensure objectivity in all of their activities. The survey was designed according to principles of best practices in survey research and questionnaire design, and the analysis of the data and interpretation of the analysis results were done according to widely-accepted principles in social science, all intended to assure objectivity and accuracy.

49. USC CESR selected and invited potential survey respondents to complete a questionnaire via the Internet. None of the staff at USC CESR had any direct contact with the respondents other than the email messages contained in Appendix C.

Are the Experts Who Designed, Conducted, or Analyzed the Survey Appropriately Skilled and Experienced?

50. The experts involved in the design, conduct, and analysis of this survey are appropriately skilled and experienced. They include:

- Jon Krosnick: I earned an A.B. from Harvard University in psychology and an M.A. and a PhD. from the University of Michigan in social psychology. As a part of my undergraduate and graduate studies, I received extensive training in social psychology, survey and experimental research techniques, and statistical data analysis. I have decades of experience conducting hundreds of surveys and am a nationally recognized expert in survey research. I have held faculty positions at

The Ohio State University and Stanford University and have worked as a consultant for numerous organizations. I am a staff researcher at the U.S. Census Bureau advising and participating in survey research. I have served as the Co-Principal Investigator of the American National Election Studies, the nation's pre-eminent survey study of voters and elections. I have served as editor or reviewer for the top peer-reviewed journals in the social sciences. My research has been recognized by the Erik H. Erikson Early Career Award, by election as a Fellow by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and the American Association for the Advancement of Science, two fellowships at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, and election as a fellow by the American Psychological Association, the American Psychological Society, and the Society for Personality and Social Psychology. In addition, I was awarded the lifetime career achievement award from the American Association for Public Opinion Research, the world's leading professional organization of survey researchers.

- Amanda Scott: Dr. Scott earned a B.A. from Ohio Wesleyan University and an M.A. and PhD. from the Ohio State University. Dr. Amanda Scott is a social psychologist whose academic training focused primarily on stereotyping, group behavior, and legal decision-making and involved extensive training in methodology. As a graduate student, she began collaborating with me by conducting a large-scale survey of passengers at the Port Columbus International Airport. As field director for that project, she was responsible for all data collection activities and for statistical analysis of the data. She has over 14 years of professional and consulting experience in applied research, including project management and statistical support work with me in my conduct of survey research in the context of litigation.
- Michael Welsh: Dr. Welsh earned a B.S. from Colorado State University and an M.S. and PhD. from the University of Wisconsin – Madison. Dr. Welsh is a natural resource economist. He has over 30 years of practical experience in the design and implementation of survey research to support public policy analysis and litigation. Dr. Welsh collaborated with me for more than 5 years on the design, implementation, and analysis of a national level personal interview project sponsored by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Are the Experts Who Will Testify About Surveys Conducted by Others Appropriately Skilled and Experienced?

51. I am qualified to discuss the survey that I conducted.

Was an Appropriate Universe or Population Identified?

52. For this survey, the population is all adults living in the United States, age 18 and older.

Did the Sampling Frame Approximate the Population?

53. The sampling frame was a comprehensive set of residential addresses in the U.S.

Does the Sample Approximate the Relevant Characteristics of the Population?

What Is the Evidence That Nonresponse Did Not Bias the Results of the Survey?

54. A sample of U.S. adults age 18 and older was selected from the USC CESR Understanding America panel. The panel encompasses adults nationwide aged 18 and over, living in randomly selected households, by zip-code, from a postal delivery sequence file provided by a commercial vendor. The majority of panel members have their own online access prior to joining the panel; others were provided, by USC CESR, a tablet and/or an Internet subscription.

What Procedures Were Used to Reduce the Likelihood of a Biased Sample?

55. The respondents were members of a panel of individuals whose households were selected randomly, by zip-code from a postal delivery sequence file provided by a commercial vendor. Selected individuals received by Priority Mail a 10-minute paper and pencil survey (English/Spanish) with a \$5 prepaid incentive and a promise of \$15 upon the return of a completed questionnaire via the enclosed postage paid envelope. At the end of the questionnaire, the questionnaire asked about interest in participating in other research projects. People who expressed an interest in study participation were asked for contact information (name, telephone, email address). Multiple attempts/contacts were made to obtain a completed questionnaire from the selected individuals.

What Precautions Were Taken to Ensure That Only Qualified Respondents Were Included in the Survey?

56. All respondents were qualified to participate – none were screened out.

Were Questions on the Survey Framed to Be Clear, Precise, and Unbiased?

57. The questions were drafted according to the principles of optimal questionnaire measurement identified in the published peer reviewed academic literatures on survey methodology and related fields, drawing on my expertise and years of experience in the field. I have published numerous papers on this topic and am confident that I crafted questions that were clear, precise, and unbiased. These best practices principles are designed to maximize question clarity and precision and to avoid bias.

Were Some Respondents Likely to Have No Opinion? If So, What Steps Were Taken to Reduce Guessing?

58. Respondents saw photographs of one of three dog food packages, answered questions about their perceptions of the quality and healthiness of the food, and about their experiences owning dogs.

59. A large volume of literature suggests that sometimes when answering questions, respondents hesitate before answering because they are not completely sure of the meaning of a question or the meanings of answer choices or are uncertain about whether they are sufficiently confident in their answers to justify expressing an opinion (e.g., Krosnick, J. A. 2002. The causes of no-opinion responses to attitude measures in surveys: They rarely are what they appear to be. In R. M. Groves, D. A. Dillman, J. L. Eltinge, and R. J. A. Little (Eds.), Survey Nonresponse. New York: Wiley, 88-100). Research has indicated that in such situations, it is best to encourage respondents to answer substantively, even if they are not completely sure, because their answers are highly likely to reveal reliable judgments. But if a respondent prefers not to answer, he or she should be permitted to do so. (e.g., Krosnick, J. A., & Presser, S. 2010. Questionnaire design. In

J. D. Wright & P. V. Marsden (Eds.), Handbook of Survey Research (Second Edition). West Yorkshire, England: Emerald Group).

60. In this survey, if a respondent volunteered that he or she did not know the answer to a question (by skipping the question), the following message was displayed: “We noticed that you didn’t answer the question below. We would be really grateful if you’d be willing to answer it as accurately as you can, even if you’re not completely sure of your answer. But if you prefer not to answer the question, just click on the NEXT button below.” If the respondent skipped the question again, he or she was not probed further, and the next question was displayed.

Did the Survey Use Open-Ended or Closed-Ended Questions? How Was the Choice in Each Instance Justified?

61. The large volume of literature on questionnaire design indicates that an open-ended format is optimal when the construct being measured is (1) a number, or (2) non-numeric and categorical, with a universe of possible answers that cannot be known in advance of administering the survey. Otherwise, closed-ended questions function well (e.g., Krosnick, J. A., & Presser, S. 2010. Questionnaire design. In J. D. Wright & P. V. Marsden (Eds.), Handbook of Survey Research (Second Edition). West Yorkshire, England: Emerald Group).

62. In this survey, all measurements of numbers were made using open-ended questions. For example, respondents were asked how many dogs they had owned: "What is the total number of dogs you have owned since you were 18 years old?" No questions involved answer choices that were non-numeric and categorical with an unknown universe of possible responses.

If Probes Were Used to Clarify Ambiguous or Incomplete Answers, What Steps Were Taken to Ensure That the Probes Were Not Leading and Were Administered in a Consistent Fashion?

63. No probes were used in this survey.

What Approach Was Used to Avoid or Measure Potential Order or Context Effects?

64. Question order effects (also called context effects) occur when asking one question changes a person's answers to a subsequent question, which would have been answered differently had the prior question not been asked. Although the scholarly literature has documented question order effects for particular types of questions (e.g., asking a general question before asking specific versions of the same question, such as whether you like your life overall and whether you like specific aspects of your life), in general, question order effects have been found to occur rarely. For example, Smith (Smith, T. W. 1991. Context effects in the General Social Survey. In P. P. Biemer, R. M. Groves, L. E. Lyberg, N. A. Mathiowetz, & S. Sudman (Eds.), Measurement Error in Surveys. New York: John Wiley) conducted a large-scale analysis of many experiments and found that "Overall the number of context effects created by the rotation design employed by the GSS prior to 1988 are minuscule; 11-12 probable order effects out of over 500 variables" (p. 69). Similarly, Schuman and Presser (Schuman, H., & Presser, S. 1981. Questions and Answers in Attitude Surveys: Experiments on Question Form, Wording, and Context. New York: Academic Press) conducted a similar analysis with data from 113 different experiments and found 8 statistically significant effects, just two more than would be expected by chance alone. Therefore, the threat of question order effects is quite minimal.

65. Diamond (2011) suggested using a particular type of order when asking general and specific questions on the same topic, but this study's questionnaire included no such sequences.

She also suggested randomizing the order of questions to minimize the potential for question order effects. We did not do this because no question sequences in the questionnaire match ones that past research indicates were at risk for question order effects. And randomizing question order would transform an orderly sequence of questions into an incomprehensible shuffling from question topic to question topic and thereby compromise measurement quality.

If the Survey Was Designed to Test a Causal Proposition, Did the Survey Include an Appropriate Control Group or Question?

66. Causal propositions were tested by randomly assigning respondents to read no corrective statement or one of two corrective statements about a dog food. About one-third of the respondents were the control group, meaning that they did not see a corrective statement. About one-third of the respondents were in the first treatment group, meaning they saw the first corrective statement. And the remaining about one-third of respondents were in the second treatment group, meaning they saw the second corrective statement.

What Limitations Are Associated with the Mode of Data Collection Used in the Survey?

67. Self-administration via computers has been shown to yield especially accurate measurements when a probability sample is recruited, as was done for this study.

Were the Interviewers Appropriately Selected and Trained?

68. No interviewers were involved in conducting this survey.

What Did the Interviewers Know About the Survey and Its Sponsorship?

69. None of the interviewers who called potential respondents knew about the sponsorship of the survey or its purpose.

What Procedures Were Used to Ensure and Determine That the Survey Was Administered to Minimize Error and Bias?

70. Diamond (2011) listed three methods for ensuring that a survey is administered to minimize error and bias: monitoring interviews, validation of interviews, and reviewing the work done by individual interviewers. None of these apply in the present case, because interviewers were not involved in data collection.

What Was Done to Ensure That the Data Were Recorded Accurately?

71. No interviewers collected or recorded data in this study, so data entry from interviewers is not a concern. Extensive testing of the online questionnaire was conducted to ensure that answers were recorded accurately.

What Was Done to Ensure That the Grouped Data Were Classified Consistently and Accurately?

72. No data were coded in this study.

When Was Information About the Survey Methodology and Results Disclosed?

73. Information about the survey methodology and results is disclosed fully in this report.

Does the Survey Report Include Complete and Detailed Information on All Relevant Characteristics?

74. Diamond (2011) listed several specific areas that should be discussed in any survey report, and all are discussed here. These include:

- “The purpose of the survey” (p. 415): This is described in this report.
- “A definition of the target population and a description of the sampling frame” (p. 415): This is described in this report.
- “A description of the sample design, including the method of selecting respondents, the method of interview, the number of callbacks, respondent eligibility or screening criteria and method, and other pertinent information” (p.

415): This is described in this report.

- “A description of the results of sample implementation, including the number of potential respondents contacted, potential respondents not reached, noneligibles, refusals, incomplete interviews or terminations, and completed interviews” (p. 415): The equivalent of these for online surveys are included in this report.
- “The exact wording of the questions used, including a copy of each version of the actual questionnaire, interviewer instructions, and visual exhibits” (p. 415): This is described in this report.
- “A description of any special scoring (e.g., grouping of verbatim responses into broader categories)” (p. 416): This did not occur in this study.
- “A description of any weighting or estimating procedures used” (p. 416): This is described in this report.
- “Estimates of the sampling error, where appropriate (i.e., in probability samples)” (p. 416): This is described in this report.
- “Statistical tables clearly labeled and identified regarding the source of the data, including the number of raw cases forming the base for each table, row, or column” (p. 416): This is done in this report.
- “Copies of interviewer instructions, validation results, and code books.” (p. 416): Since interviewers did not collect data in this study, this report does not address issues involving interviewers. No codebooks were created.

In Surveys of Individuals, What Measures Were Taken to Protect the Identities of Individual Respondents?

75. None of the primary researchers (me and employees at The Strategy Team) were provided information about who was selected to be invited to participate in the survey or who participated.

76. All identifying information was stored on password-protected computers. In the data files possessed by the primary researchers, respondents were identified only by numbers that could not be connected to their names. Only USC CESR had access to that link for sample management and incentive fulfillment purposes, and USC CESR employees are professionally

committed to protecting these identities and never revealing them, according to the code of ethics of the professional association of their industry, the American Association for Public Opinion Research.

77. Diamond (2011) said that “Copies of all questionnaires should be made available upon request so that the opposing party has an opportunity to evaluate the raw data. All identifying information, such as the respondent’s name, address, and telephone number, should be removed to ensure respondent confidentiality” (p. 418). In keeping with this advice, the identities of respondents are not provided as part of the survey documentation in this report, and the primary investigators do not possess such information.

Results

78. The results of this survey support the central conclusion of interest (details are provided in the Technical Report in this document): providing information about the risk of the presence of pentobarbital in the dog foods statistically significantly decreased the perceived quality and healthiness of the dog foods. Two different statements were tested, and both produced equivalent effects on perceptions of quality and healthiness.

79. I also found that the impact of this information on how the products were evaluated was observed among various subgroups of respondents, including: people who spent more money on dog food and people who did not do this, people who owned more dogs and people who did not, people who owned dogs during the class period and people who did not, people who bought dog food from a pet store and did not, completed the questionnaire earlier in the field period and people who completed it later, people who took longer to complete the questionnaire and people who did not, people were female, were not female, were more educated, were not more educated, had higher household incomes, were married, were older, and were not older, who did not live in

households by themselves or with only one other person, people who lived in a household with at least one child under 18 years old, and people who did not live in those households, people who live in the Northeast or Midwest and people who do not live in these areas, people who are working as a paid employee, people who are white and non-Hispanic, and people who are not white and non-Hispanic.

80. In sum, the results are consistent with the conclusion that disclosing additional information about the alleged risk of the presence of pentobarbital in an ingredient of the dog foods decreased perceived quality and healthiness by statistically significant amounts. Both versions of a statement providing this information had equivalent effects.

Conclusion

81. This case constitutes a sensible context in which to take advantage of the science of survey research methodology for informing the Court. By designing and implementing a survey implementing best practices, data were gathered on the central issues at stake in this case efficiently and cost-effectively.

I make this declaration under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States and the State of California this 13^h day of August, 2019, at Portola Valley, California.



Jon A. Krosnick

Technical Report
Survey Methods and Results

INTRODUCTION

67. A study was conducted to gather information about people's perceptions of dog foods made by Champion. To do this, the following steps were taken.
68. First, case documents were reviewed. Then a questionnaire was designed to measure perceptions of the quality and healthiness of Champion dog foods, in addition to additional assessments of respondents' experiences owning dogs.
69. Plaintiffs' attorneys provided images of 13-pound packages of three Champion products: Orijen Regional Red dog food, Acana Appalachian Ranch dog food and Acana Heritage Red Meat dog food. These were the focus of the experiment embedded in the survey to assess perceptions of quality and healthiness.
70. An analysis was conducted to assess the similarity of these 16 packages to one another. To conduct this analysis, elements that were present on the packages were identified, and the packages were analyzed to determine what percentage of the packages contained each element. Two researchers reviewed each set of packages to judge whether the packages contained the element in question, and a third researcher resolved any differences. Three products were shown to respondents: Orijen Regional Red, Acana Appalachian Ranch, and Acana Heritage Red Meat Formula, all 13 pound packages from 2018. As the next table suggests, the packages in this set uniformly or nearly uniformly share many common elements with the packages shown to respondents, which justifies generalizing the findings of this experiment across packages of different sizes and years.

Images of the Fronts of All of the Packages Included in this Analysis





Page Break

Images of the Backs of All of the Packages Included in this Analysis





71. As the next table suggests, the packages in this set uniformly or nearly uniformly share many common elements with the packages shown to respondents, which justifies generalizing the findings of this experiment across packages of different sizes and years.

Percent of Packages with Each Package Element Present

Element (Text, Image, or Idea that Appears on the Package)	Percent of Packages with the Element Present (N = 16)
"Acana" or "Orijen"	100%
Type of food (E.g., Six Fish, Duck & Pear, Tundra, Regional Red, Meadowland)	100%
Description of key ingredients in food	100%
"Biologically appropriate"	100%
"Never outsourced"	100%
"Wholeprey" or "Whole Prey"	100%
List of percentages of animal ingredients vs. vegetables, fruits, and/or botanicals vs. grain, potato, gluten(s)/tapioca, plant protein concentrates, oats and/or GMO	100%
0(%) (any of following) grain, potato, gluten(s)/tapioca, plant protein concentrates, GMO	100%
"Botanicals"	100%
"Vegetables"	100%
"Fruits"	100%
Photo of plant(s) or animal(s) (ingredients)	100%
"Fresh" ingredients	100%
"Regional" ingredients	100%
Photo of vista / outdoors / agricultural landscape	100%
Statement about vista / outdoors / landscape shown (e.g. "AMERICA'S VAST AND FERTILE LANDS")	100%
Caption to photo of vista / outdoors / agricultural landscape contains "Our source of inspiration"	100%
Statement about the food being rich in protein	100%
Statement suggesting that the food is low in carbohydrates	100%
Statement about keeping dogs happy and strong	100%
Icons for biologically appropriate, fresh regional ingredients, and never outsourced	100%
"All breeds"	100%
"All...life stages"	100%
Total weight of food in package	100%
Photo of a supplier (farmer, fisher, etc), with person and business name	100%
"People we (know and) trust"	100%
"Organs"	100%
"Cartilage"	100%
Ingredients	100%

"Guaranteed analysis" table	100%
Daily ration and feeding guide / feeding instructions based on size	100%
Daily ration based on activity level	100%
Rations / instructions for puppies, gestation, and lactation	100%
Champion Petfoods / Champion Freeze-dried / Dogstar Kitchens / Northstar Kitchens Logo	100%
Address of company / location where product produced	100%
Customer care information	100%
Facebook, Twitter, and/or Instagram icons	100%
"Formulated to meet the nutritional levels established by the AAFCO Dog Food Nutrient Profiles for all life stages."	100%
Graphic of plant(s) and/or animal(s) (ingredients)	100%
"championpetfoods.com"	100%
Reference to "trusted" supplier / producer	100%
Statement suggesting that reading the ingredients will please the reader	100%
Reference to wolf ancestry / evolution / evolutionary diet	100%
Ingredients delivered fresh, raw, and/or daily	100%
Statement that food is made / prepared in company's own kitchens	100%
Refers to (Mother) Nature's wisdom, designs, or intentions (besides / in addition to "Nourish as nature intended")	100%
"Award-winning" (or shows awards won)	94%
"Ingredients we love"	94%
Provides weight of the key ingredients in the package (e.g., 1lb whole Atlantic mackerel)	94%
Statement about pride (e.g. "Prepared with pride" or "Kentucky Proud")	94%
Freeze-dried ingredients (mentioned on package besides in ingredient list)	94%
Proportion fresh (or raw) and proportion dried (or oils) (e.g. "Half are FRESH or RAW and loaded with goodness and taste, and half are DRIED or OILS that provide a strong and natural source of animal proteins and fats.")	94%
Statement about how each dog is unique	88%
"Trusted everywhere"	88%
Calorie Content: metabolizable energy (ME) listed	88%
Social media handle(s)	88%
Statement suggesting the food is low in additives or preservatives or is preserved naturally	88%
"Calories distributed to support peak conditioning with" [XX% from protein], [XX% from carbohydrates], [XX% from fat], [etc.]	81%
Signature of Reinhard Muhlenfeld, Founder	81%
Made in the USA / Made in Canada	75%

72. A questionnaire was designed according to best practices in survey research. The final version of the questionnaire appears in Appendix B.

Survey Design

73. Each respondent was randomly assigned to see one of three dog food packages:

- Approximately one-third of respondents saw Orijen Regional Red.
- Approximately one-third of respondents saw Acana Appalachian Ranch.
- Approximately one-third of respondents saw Acana Heritage Red.

74. After seeing photos of one side of the package, respondents read a transcript of all of the words on the side they had just viewed. This process was repeated for all sides of the package.

75. Next, respondents read either zero or one of two pieces of additional information. Each of the two pieces of additional information was a statement provided by Plaintiffs' attorneys about the possibility that the product might contain pentobarbital. The display of each piece of information was independently randomly assigned to sample members before they started answering the questionnaire, using random numbers obtained from random.org. The two corrective statements were:

- The dog food you saw may contain a drug called pentobarbital. According to the U.S. government, pentobarbital is used to calm animals, to put them to sleep, to reduce their feelings of pain, and to end their lives.
- According to the U.S. government, the dog food you saw was made with meat products provided by a company that did not make sure to keep out meat from animals whose lives had been ended by giving them a drug called pentobarbital.

76. After looking at images of packaging, reading the words on the package, and possibly reading a statement about the possibility of pentobarbital being in the product they just reviewed, respondents were asked about their perceptions of the quality and healthiness of the product.

Respondents

77. USC CESR provided the respondents for the survey. The respondents were members of their Understanding America Study panel. The panel members were recruited by a process that began with random selection of residential addresses in the U.S. People living at those addresses received invitations to join the panel and complete questionnaires regularly. A description of the methodology used to build the Understanding America Study Panel appears in the field report provided by USC CESR in Appendix C.

78. On July 25, 2019, USC CESR emailed and mailed invitations to participate.²⁹ The invitations provided a link to the online questionnaire. Respondents could access the questionnaire by clicking the link and providing a specified login number and password.
79. The questionnaire was programmed in software hosted by USC CESR. Respondents received \$17 for completing the questionnaire.
80. USC CESR sent email reminders to potential respondents, inviting them to complete the questionnaire for this study. These email reminders were sent on July 27, 2019, August 2, 2019, and August 5, 2019. The email messages are shown in Appendix C.
81. Data were downloaded and final weights were computed for the analyses in this report on the morning of August 10, 2019.
82. 1,200 panel members were invited to complete the questionnaire, and 859 did so, so the completion rate is 76.1 percent. The survey had a cumulative response rate of 8.3% (ORR2 - see Callegaro, M., & DiSogra, C. 2008). The cumulative response rate was calculated using the panel recruitment rate and panel retention rate (provided by USC CESR) and the completion rate.

²⁹ Although formal invitations were not sent until July 25, a soft rollout began on July 23rd during which respondents could see this survey was available for them to complete, either because they visited the UAS website of their own volition, or because they had completed another UAS survey became aware that this survey was available for them to complete.

Cumulative Response Rate of Survey

Panel Recruitment Response Rate	Panel Retention Rate	Survey Completion Rate	ORR2
54.6%	72.5%	71.526%	8.3%

Weighting

83. Using standard scientific procedures, data were weighted so that the respondents in the participating sample resembled the population from which the respondents were drawn. More information on the weighting procedure appears in Appendix D. In the next table, three sets of percentages are displayed: the percent of people in different demographic groups in the U.S. population according to CPS, ACS, or NHIS benchmarks, the percent of respondents in different demographic groups in the dog food survey before weighting the data, and the percent of respondents in different demographic groups in the dog food study after weighting the data.

Demographic Group	CPS, ACS, or NHIS Percent Used as Weighting Target	Percent from Dog Food Survey with Base Weight Only	Percent from Dog Food Survey with Final Post- Stratification Weight
Male	48.27%	46.53%	48.20%
Female	51.73%	53.47%	51.80%
		(n = 859)	(n = 859)
Married	52.72%	62.08%	52.59%
Widowed/Divorced	18.54%	22.85%	18.48%
Separated			
Never married	28.74%	15.08%	28.93%
		(n = 859)	(n = 859)
Northeast	17.55%	13.79%	17.53%
Midwest	20.78%	27.28%	20.78%
South	37.90%	37.42%	37.95%
West	23.77%	21.51%	23.74%
		(n = 859)	(n = 859)
One household member	14.81%	18.56%	14.79%

Demographic Group	CPS, ACS, or NHIS Percent Used as Weighting Target	Percent from Dog Food Survey with Base Weight Only	Percent from Dog Food Survey with Final Post- Stratification Weight
Two household members	34.91%	40.12%	34.79%
Three or four household members	35.46%	32.26%	35.52%
Five or more household members	14.82%	9.06%	14.90%
		(n = 841)	(n = 841)
18-29 years old	20.80%	6.08%	20.72%
30-39 years old	17.27%	15.32%	17.29%
40-49 years old	15.92%	16.82%	15.91%
50-64 years old	25.06%	35.35%	25.09%
65 years old or older	20.95%	26.42%	20.99%
		(n = 857)	(n = 857)
No HS diploma	10.66%	2.80%	10.66%
HS graduate or equivalent	28.28%	15.36%	28.26%
Some college	27.74%	36.87%	27.78%
College Grad	21.32%	25.72%	21.31%
Post-grad	12.00%	19.25%	11.99%
		(n = 859)	(n = 859)
White only	77.72%	82.24%	77.74%
Black only	12.65%	9.19%	12.63%
Other/multi-race	9.63%	8.57%	9.63%
		(n = 858)	(n = 858)
Hispanic	16.49%	5.58%	16.46%
Not Hispanic	83.51%	94.42%	83.54%
		(n = 859)	(n = 859)
Employed	62.14%	55.69%	62.14%
Not employed	19.02%	22.13%	19.02%
Retired	18.84%	22.17%	18.84%
		(n = 857)	(n = 857)

84. Throughout this report, weighted frequencies and percentages are displayed in the tables. The weighted total number of respondents may not equal the sum of the numbers of respondents in subgroups.

RESULTS

85. The questionnaire included items tapping respondents' experiences owning dogs that indicated an inclination toward devoting effort to promoting the health of their dogs and toward promoting their own health.

86. Nine items were used to create factor1, referred to as "concern for dog":

- *DOG_HEALTHY_PRES. How important to you is it that your dog is as healthy as possible? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?*³⁰
- *DOG_SAFE_PRES. How important to you is it that your dog is as safe as possible? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?*³¹
- *BOOKS_INGRED. Did you ever read books, magazines, or information online to learn about what ingredients are in dog foods to decide which ones to buy, or did you never do that?*
- *FOOD_TASTE. If you were to buy dog food, when deciding which food to buy, how much attention would you pay to whether the food **tastes good to dogs**? A great deal of attention, a lot of attention, a moderate amount of attention, a little attention, or none at all?*
- *FOOD_HEALTH. If you were to buy dog food, when deciding which food to buy, how much attention would you pay to whether the food will **improve the health of dogs**? A great deal of attention, a lot of attention, a moderate amount of attention, a little attention, or none at all?*
- *FOOD_APPEARANCE. If you were to buy dog food, when deciding which food to buy, how much attention would you pay to whether the food will **improve the appearance of dogs**? A great deal of attention, a lot of attention, a moderate amount of attention, a little*

³⁰ Three other versions (DOG_HEALTHY_PAST, DOGS_HEALTHY_PRES, DOGS_HEALTHY_PAST) of this question were asked depending on whether the respondent currently or only formerly owned dogs and whether the respondent owned one dog or more than one dog. A summary variable collapsing across the four items was included in this analysis. See Appendix B for details.

³¹ Three other versions of this question (DOG_SAFE_PAST, DOGS_SAFE_PRES, DOGS_SAFE_PAST) were asked depending on whether the respondent currently or only formerly owned dogs and whether the respondent owned one dog or more than one dog. A summary variable collapsing across the four items was included in this analysis. See Appendix B for details.

attention, or none at all?

- *FOOD_ALLNATURAL. If you were to buy dog food, when deciding which food to buy, how much attention would you pay to whether the food is **all-natural**? A great deal of attention, a lot of attention, a moderate amount of attention, a little attention, or none at all?*
- *FOOD_GRAINFREE. If you were to buy dog food, when deciding which food to buy, how much attention would you pay to whether the food is **grain free**? A great deal of attention, a lot of attention, a moderate amount of attention, a little attention, or none at all?*
- *FOOD_ORGANIC. If you were to buy dog food, when deciding which food to buy, how much attention would you pay to whether the food is **organic**? A great deal of attention, a lot of attention, a moderate amount of attention, a little attention, or none at all?*

87. Responses to these nine questions were coded to range from 0 to 1, averaged to create an index and then squared to reflect an accelerating relation of the variables with purchasing decisions. The squared average is referred to as the “Concern for dog index.” For respondents who answered fewer than nine of the questions, their index score was the average of their non-missing values. One respondent chose not to answer any of the nine questions. A total of 126 respondents were never asked these questions because those people said earlier in the questionnaire that they never owned a dog. The value of the index for these respondents was set to -1 to allow their evaluations of the products to be included in the analysis. Additionally, a dummy variable coded to indicate whether they were missing on this index was also included.

88. Two items were used to create a second factor (called “Purchase of non-GMO / Organic”):

- *P_SHOP_ORGANIC. When you shopped for groceries during the last month, did you ever buy **organic** products, or did you not do that?*
- *P_SHOP_NONGMO. When you shopped for groceries during the last month, do you ever buy **non-GMO** products, or do you not do that?*

89. Responses to these questions were coded to range from 0 to 1, then averaged to create an index and squared to create a “Purchase of non-GMO/Organic” index. For respondents who answered only one of the two questions, their index value was their non-missing answer. One respondent chose not to answer either of these two questions. The value of the index for this respondent was set to -1 to allow his/her evaluations of the product to be included in the analysis. Additionally, a dummy variable coded to indicate whether they were missing on this index was also included.

Impact of the Corrective Statements on Evaluations of the Product

90. Of the 859 respondents who completed the questionnaire, all answered at least one of the two questions measuring perceived quality and healthiness of the product. Therefore, all 859 respondents contributed data to the analyses described next.

91. These two questions were:

- *QUALITY. How would you rate the quality of this dog food? Excellent, good, fair, poor, or very poor?*
- *HEALTHY. How healthy would you say this dog food is? Extremely healthy, very healthy, moderately healthy, slightly healthy, or not healthy at all?*

92. Responses to these two questions were transformed to quantities as follows:

- Excellent / Extremely healthy = 100
- Good / Very = 75
- Fair / Moderately = 50
- Poor / Slightly = 25
- Very Poor / Not healthy at all = 0

93. These quantities were then averaged to yield an index. If a respondent was missing a value on either quantity, the other quantity was used. Then, the parameters of an ordinary least squares regression were estimated, predicting the index using dummy variables to indicate the presence or absence of each corrective statement controlling for the “Concern for dog” index, the “Purchase of non-GMO / organic” index, a dummy variable for each index that indicated the respondent did not answer any of the questions in the index, and dummy variables representing four demographic control variables (gender, age, education, and income).

94. As shown by the two first lines in the table below, the impact of the two corrective statements was statistically significant and negative, indicating that reading either corrective statement reduced their evaluations of the quality and healthiness of the dog food as compared to people who read no corrective statement.

Estimates of the Parameters of an OLS Regression Equation Predicting Evaluations of the Dog Food Using the Presence or Absence of a Message about Pentobarbital, Gender, Age, Education, Income, the “Concern for dog” Index, and the “Purchase of non-GMO / Organic” Index

Predictor	Unstandardized Regression Coefficient	p-value
-----------	---	---------

Corrective Statement 1	-24.23	0.00
Corrective Statement 2	-20.15	0.00
Gender (female = 1)	-5.95	0.04
Age (missing = 1)	22.42	0.00
Age (age 30 - 44 = 1)	1.47	0.75
Age (age 45 - 59 = 1)	2.45	0.55
Age (age 60 or older = 1)	-1.47	0.71
Education (HS graduate or equivalent = 1)	-4.89	0.34
Education (Some college = 1)	-5.10	0.32
Education (Bachelor's degree or more = 1)	-3.00	0.58
Income (missing = 1)	1.52	0.77
Income (1 = \$30,000 to \$59,999)	3.12	0.37
Income (1 = \$60,000 to \$99,999)	-4.50	0.29
Income (1 = \$100,000 or more)	1.36	0.77
Concern for dog (1 = higher index score)	6.74	0.29
Missing concern for dog index (1 = missing)	17.83	0.06
Purchase of non-GMO / organic (1 = higher index score)	2.44	0.50
Missing purchase of non-GMO/organic index (1 = missing)	36.44	0.00
Constant	81.46	0.00
<hr/>		
N	859	
R ²	.17	
<hr/>		

95. The two tables below show how the two corrective statements reduced ratings of the quality and healthiness of the products.

Responses to Quality Question by Condition

Perceived Quality	Message 1	Message 2	No Message
Excellent	24.48%	20.78%	53.80%
Good	29.03%	39.46%	36.46%
Fair	22.19%	23.59%	8.51%
Poor	14.31%	6.65%	0.79%
Very poor	9.99%	9.51%	0.44%
Total	100%	100%	100%
N	277	289	293

Responses to Healthiness Question by Condition

Perceived Quality	Message 1	Message 2	No Message
Extremely healthy	11.67%	15.78%	26.78%
Very healthy	34.43%	28.84%	48.06%
Moderately healthy	25.19%	35.40%	22.81%
Slightly healthy	13.42%	9.55%	1.64%
Not healthy at all	15.29%	10.43%	0.71%
Total	100%	100%	100%
N	276	289	293

Results: Impact of Potential Indicator of Response Inaccuracy

96. The length of time respondents took to complete the online questionnaire was examined as a potential indicator of response inaccuracy. The time respondents opened the questionnaire and the time the respondent completed the questionnaire was recorded. The median elapsed time between opening and completing the questionnaire was approximately 14 minutes.

Completing the questionnaire very quickly or slowly may indicate inaccuracies in a respondent's data.

97. Answering questions quickly may indicate that a respondent did not read completely or did not think much about the questions. Taking a long time to complete the questionnaire may indicate that a respondent was temporarily interrupted, which could attenuate any effects of the corrective information.
98. The majority of respondents completed the questionnaire in 5 to 20 minutes. Fewer than 5% of respondents completed the questionnaire in less than five minutes, and fewer than 3% of respondents spent 30 minutes or more completing the questionnaire. As shown in the next table, these numbers are so small as to indicate there is no substantial risk that very quick or very slow completion compromised the accuracy of the results reported thus far.

Distribution of Time Spent Completing the Questionnaire³²

Number of Minutes	Percent of Respondents	Cumulative Percent of Respondents
Less than 5 minutes	2.10%	2.10%
5 to less than 10 minutes	23.17%	25.26%
10 to less than 15 minutes	29.34%	54.60%
15 to less than 20 minutes	18.04%	72.64%
20 to less than 30 minutes	14.20%	86.85%
30 to less than 55 minutes	5.24%	92.08%
55 minutes or more	7.92%	100.00%
N	859	

³² The numbers in this table are unweighted.

Effects of Corrective Statements in Subgroups

99. The expected effects of a corrective statement on perceived quality and healthiness of the foods was apparent in a variety of subgroups of the respondents, indicating generality of the finding observed with all respondents.
100. Throughout this section, the questions used in these analyses are described. In all cases, a dummy variable for each characteristic was generated to create two categories, with respondents who had the attribute of interest coded 1 and all other respondents (including respondents who were missing on the variable) coded 0.
101. First, the effect was examined among respondents with various characteristics related to dog ownership, including:
- Respondents who reported owning a relatively larger number of dogs since they were 18 years old (i.e., more than two dogs)
 - Respondents who reported owning dogs during the class period (i.e., owned one or more dogs since the start of the class period - July 1, 2013)
 - Respondents who reported spending a relatively large amount of money on food per dog (i.e., spent more than \$1.28 per month, per pound, per dog on average)
 - Respondents who said they bought pet food at a store that sells only pet supplies
102. Dummy variables were generated to represent these subgroups. The first question analyzed was the number of dogs owned as an adult:
- *DOG_NUM. What is the total number of dogs you have owned since you were 18 years old?*
103. Next respondents indicated if they owned dogs during the class period by answering one of four questions, depending on prior answers to other questions in the questionnaire:
- *DOG_CURR. Do you own that dog now, or do you not own it now?*
 - *DOGS_CURR. Do you own one of those dogs now, or do you not own any of those dogs now?*
 - *DOG_CLASS. Did you own that dog before July 1, 2013, or did you not own it then?*
 - *DOGS_CLASS. Did you own any of those dogs before July 1, 2013, or did you not own any of them then?*

104. A computation of the amount of money spent per pound of dog was created by first averaging across responses to three questions to determine the average weight, in pounds, of the dogs owned by respondents:

- *WEIGHT1A. In the box below, please type how many pounds your dog has weighed, on average, during the time you have owned it.*
- *WEIGHT1B. In the box below, please type how many pounds your dog weighed, on average, during the time you have owned it.*
- *WEIGHTX. In the boxes below, please type how many pounds each of your dogs weighed, on average, during the time you have owned it.*³³

105. To measure the amount of money spent on dog food per month, on average, respondents were asked one of two questions, depending on how many dogs they had owned:

- *DOG_FOODSPEND. During the time when you have owned a dog, how much money did you spend for your dog's food per month, on average?*
- *DOGS_FOODSPEND. During the time when you have owned dogs, how much money did you spend for your dogs' food per month, on average?*

106. The weight and food spend variables were winsorized, which means that outlying values were recoded to the highest or lowest value in the distribution. This was done by identifying all values that were three standard deviations above or below the mean, setting those variables to missing, then recoding them to the highest or lowest non-outlying value.

107. Finally, the average amount of money spent on dogs per month was divided by the average weight of the dog(s) respondents owned to compute the average amount of money spent per pound per month. This average was winsorized as described previously. A new variable was created to indicate whether a respondent spent more or less on pet food.

108. Whether respondents ever bought dog in a pet food store was measured with this question:

- *FOOD_PETSTORE. Did you ever buy dog food from a store that sells only pet supplies, or did you never do that?*

109. To test the effect of a corrective message on the product evaluation within different subgroups, a series of OLS regressions were estimated predicting the variable of interest with the demographic controls previously mentioned. When a subgroup indicator was perfectly collinear with one or more of the demographic control variables, the demographic control variable was eliminated from the model.

³³ This question was repeated, displaying the appropriate number of boxes for the number of dogs reported. A maximum of 20 boxes were displayed.

110. The next tables show the effect of each corrective statement on product evaluation was statistically significant and negative in all of the subgroups of respondents examined. The final column in the tables indicate there was only one statistically significant difference in the strength of the effect in the categories that are shaded similar colors in the table

**Effect of Message 1 on Evaluations of the Dog Food in Population Subgroups
(Controlling for Gender, Age, Education, Income, the “Concern for dog” index, and the
“Purchase of non-GMO / organic” index)**

Subgroup	N	Effect of Message 1	t	p-value	Significant Difference in Effect Between Categories?
Owned more than two dogs	384	-25.09	-4.72	0.00	No
Did not own more than two dogs	475	-23.48	-5.77	0.00	
Owned dogs during the class period	640	-25.71	-6.69	0.00	No
Did not own dogs during the class period	219	-20.30	-3.56	0.00	
Spent more money on dog food	308	-22.01	-3.71	0.00	No
Did not spend more on dog food	551	-25.14	-6.41	0.00	
Bought dog food from a pet store	483	-30.60	-7.07	0.00	Yes
Did not buy dog food from a pet store	376	-14.77	-3.30	0.00	

**Effect of Message 2 on Evaluations of the Dog Food in Population Subgroups
(Controlling for Gender, Age, Education, Income, the “Concern for dog” index, and the
“Purchase of non-GMO / organic” index)**

Subgroup	N	Effect of Message 2	t	p-value	Significant Difference in Effect Between Categories?
Owned more than two dogs	384	-21.15	-4.82	0.00	No
Did not own more than two dogs	475	-19.05	-5.00	0.00	
Owned dogs during the class period	640	-21.28	-6.45	0.00	No
Did not own dogs during the class period	219	-17.05	-2.76	0.01	
Spent more money on dog food	308	-18.02	-4.35	0.00	No
Did not spend more on dog food	551	-21.54	-5.55	0.00	
Bought dog food from a pet store	483	-23.41	-5.86	0.00	No
Did not buy dog food from a pet store	376	-16.06	-3.74	0.00	

111. Next, the effects of corrective statements on perceptions of the foods were examined among respondents who:

- Completed the questionnaire earlier in the field period (i.e., first four days of the survey)
- Took longer to complete the questionnaire (i.e., 15 or more minutes)

112. The date and time the respondent began the questionnaire and the date and time the respondent submitted the questionnaire was recorded by the on-line survey software. These variables were recoded such that respondents who completed earlier were coded 1, and all other respondents were coded 0 for one variable, and respondents who took 15 or more minutes to complete the questionnaire were coded 1, and all other respondents were coded 0.

113. As the next table shows, the effect of the corrective statements was again negative and statistically significant in all subgroups, as expected.

Effect of Message 1 on Evaluations of the Dog Food Among Respondents Who Completed the Questionnaire Early or Slowly (Controlling for Gender, Age, Education, Income, the “Concern for dog” Index, and the “Purchase of non-GMO / organic” Index

Subgroup	N	Effect of Message 1	t	p-value	Significant Difference in Effect Between Categories?
Completed the questionnaire earlier in the field period	452	-27.66	-5.92	0.00	No
Did not complete the questionnaire earlier in the field period	407	-20.24	-5.01	0.00	
Took longer to complete the questionnaire	390	-24.41	-4.85	0.00	No
Did not take longer to complete the questionnaire	469	-24.03	-5.94	0.00	

Effect of Message 2 on Evaluations of the Dog Food Among Respondents Who Completed the Questionnaire Early or Slowly (Controlling for Gender, Age, Education, Income, the “Concern for dog” Index, and the “Purchase of non-GMO / organic” Index

Subgroup	N	Effect of Message 2	t	p-value	Significant Difference in Effect Between Categories?
Completed the questionnaire earlier in the field period	452	-20.18	-5.92	0.00	No
Did not complete the questionnaire earlier in the field period	407	-20.18	-4.16	0.00	
Took longer to complete the questionnaire	390	-23.18	-5.34	0.00	No
Did not take longer to complete the questionnaire	469	-16.89	-4.42	0.00	

114. Next, the effects of corrective statements on perceptions of the foods were examined among respondents in various demographic subgroups:

- Respondents who were female vs. all other respondents
- Respondents who were more educated (i.e., had a B.A. degree or higher) vs. all other respondents
- Respondents who had higher household incomes (those who reported 2018 household incomes of \$60,000 or more) vs. all other respondents
- Respondents who were married vs. all other respondents
- Respondents who were older (aged 45 or more) vs. all other respondents
- Respondents who lived in households by themselves or with one other person vs. all other respondents.
- Respondents who lived in households with at least one child under age 18 vs. all other respondents.
- Respondents who lived in households that had only cellular telephone service vs. all other respondents.
- Respondents who lived in one-family detached homes vs. all other respondents.
- Respondents who lived in household where someone owned or was buying the house with a mortgage or loan.
- Respondents who lived in the Northeast or Midwest vs. all other respondents.
- Respondents who were working as a paid employee vs. all other respondents.
- White, non-Hispanic respondents vs. all other respondents.

115. USC CESR collected these demographic data via their routine panel screening questionnaires, so the questions were not asked in the present survey.

116. As the next tables show, the effect of the corrective statements was negative and statistically significant in all subgroups, and the effect differed statistically significantly only with regard to the effect of message 1 for the age subgroups.

The Effect of Message 1 on Evaluations of the Dog Food in Various Demographic Subgroups, Controlling for Gender, Age, Education, the “Concern for dog” Index, and the “Purchase of non-GMO / organic” Index

Subgroup	N	Effect of Number of Message 1	t	p-value	Significant Difference Between Categories?
Female	445	-29.23	-5.83	0.00	No
Not Female	414	-18.00	-4.14	0.00	
More education (Have a B.A. or more)	286	-18.75	-3.39	0.00	No
Did not have a B.A. or more	573	-27.33	-6.84	0.00	
Higher household income (over \$60,000 in 2018)	402	-23.07	-4.61	0.00	No
Household income not over \$60,000 in 2018	457	-25.27	-5.89	0.00	
Married	452	-18.67	-4.87	0.00	No
Not married	407	-30.38	-5.72	0.00	
Older respondents (over age 45)	456	-16.78	-4.56	0.00	Yes
Respondents who were not over 45 years old	403	-32.22	-6.11	0.00	
Household size is one or two	415	-20.78	-4.56	0.00	No
Household size is not one or two	444	-27.16	-5.90	0.00	
Household has at least one child	281	-24.37	-4.33	0.00	No
Household does not have at least one child	578	-23.96	-6.17	0.00	
Respondent lives in Northeast or Midwest	329	-25.57	-5.94	0.00	No
Respondent does not live in Northeast or Midwest	530	-23.41	-5.17	0.00	
Respondent is working as a paid employee	518	-26.64	-6.33	0.00	No

Subgroup	N	Effect of Number of Message 1	t	p-value	Significant Difference Between Categories?
Respondent is not working as a paid employee	341	-20.60	-3.98	0.00	No
Respondent is white and non-Hispanic	547	-22.74	-6.02	0.00	
Respondent is not white and non-Hispanic	307	-25.52	-4.51	0.00	

The Effect of Message 2 on Evaluations of the Dog Food in Various Demographic Subgroups, Controlling for Gender, Age, Education, the “Concern for dog” Index, and the “Purchase of non-GMO / organic” Index

Subgroup	N	Effect of Number of Message 2	t	p-value	Significant Difference Between Categories?
Female	445	-24.21	-5.74	0.00	No
Not Female	414	-14.63	-3.72	0.00	
More education (Have a B.A. or more)	286	-19.44	-3.50	0.00	No
Did not have a B.A. or more	573	-20.66	-6.04	0.00	
Higher household income (over \$60,000 in 2018)	402	-21.30	-4.80	0.00	No
Household income not over \$60,000 in 2018	457	-19.17	-4.92	0.00	
Married	452	-17.75	-4.71	0.00	No
Not married	407	-22.91	-5.12	0.00	
Older respondents (over age 45)	456	-22.05	-5.90	0.00	No
Respondents who were not over 45 years old	403	-18.95	-4.21	0.00	

Subgroup	N	Effect of Number of Message 2	t	p-value	Significant Difference Between Categories?
Household size is one or two	415	-18.46	-4.64	0.00	No
Household size is not one or two	444	-21.35	-5.13	0.00	
Household has at least one child	281	-15.08	-3.15	0.00	No
Household does not have at least one child	578	-22.06	-6.26	0.00	
Respondent lives in Northeast or Midwest	329	-16.12	-3.81	0.00	No
Respondent does not live in Northeast or Midwest	530	-22.61	-5.92	0.00	
Respondent is working as a paid employee	518	-19.63	-5.24	0.00	No
Respondent is not working as a paid employee	341	-21.65	-4.63	0.00	
Respondent is white and non-Hispanic	547	-22.59	-6.87	0.00	No
Respondent is not white and non-Hispanic	307	-14.23	-2.46	0.01	

References

- Callegaro, M. & DiSogra, C. (2008). Computing Response Metrics for Online Panels, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 72. 5. Pp 1008 to 1032 <https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfn065>.
- DeBell, M., Krosnick, J.A., Lupia, A. & Roberts, C. (2009). User's Guide to the Advance Release of the 2008-2009 ANES Panel Study. Palo Alto, CA and Ann Arbor, MI: Stanford University and University of Michigan.

Appendix A:

Curriculum Vita of Jon Krosnick

CURRICULUM VITAE

Jon A. Krosnick

Home Address 10 La Sandra Way
Portola Valley, California 94028
(650) 851-9143

Office Address 434 McClatchy Hall
Stanford University
450 Serra Mall
Stanford, California 94305
(650) 725-3031

E-mail: Krosnick@stanford.edu
Fax: (650) 725-2472

Websites <http://www.jonkrosnick.com>
<http://communication.stanford.edu/faculty/krosnick.html>
<http://www.stanford.edu/group/polisci/faculty/krosnick.html>
<http://climatepublicopinion.stanford.edu/>
<https://pprg.stanford.edu/>
<http://bps.stanford.edu/>
<http://sipp.stanford.edu/>

Education The Lawrenceville School, with academic distinction, 1976.

A.B., Harvard University (in Psychology, Magna Cum Laude), 1980.

M.A., University of Michigan (in Social Psychology, with Honors), 1983.

Ph.D., University of Michigan (in Social Psychology), 1986.

Employment

2017-	Affiliated Faculty Member, Emmett Interdisciplinary Program in Environment and Resources, Stanford University.
2015-	Research Advisor, Gallup, Princeton, New Jersey.
2015-	Affiliate, Woods Institute for the Environment, Stanford University.
2014-2016	Affiliated Faculty Member, Meta-Research Innovation Center at Stanford (METRICS), Stanford University.
2013-2014	Visiting Research Collaborator, Princeton Institute for International and Regional Studies and the Princeton Environmental Institute, Princeton University.
2010-	Research Psychologist, Center for Survey Measurement, U.S. Census Bureau, United States Department of Commerce.

2009-2010	Research Psychologist, Statistical Research Division, U.S. Census Bureau, United States Department of Commerce.
2007-	Research Professor, Survey Research Laboratory, University of Illinois.
2005-2011	Co-Principal Investigator, American National Election Studies.
2004-	Frederic O. Glover Professor in Humanities and Social Sciences, Stanford University.
2004-	Professor, Department of Communication, Stanford University.
2004-	Professor, Department of Political Science, Stanford University.
2004-	Professor, Department of Psychology (by courtesy), Stanford University.
2004-2009	Associate Director, Institute for Research in the Social Sciences, Stanford University.
2008-2014	Senior Fellow, Woods Institute for the Environment (by courtesy), Stanford University.
2005-2008	Senior Fellow, Woods Institute for the Environment, Stanford University.
2004-2007	Director, Methods of Analysis Program in the Social Sciences, Stanford University.
2004-2006	Visiting Professor, Department of Psychology, The Ohio State University.
2003-2004	Visiting Professor, Department of Communication, Stanford University.
1986-2004	Assistant to Associate to Full Professor, Departments of Psychology and Political Science, The Ohio State University.
1987-1989	Adjunct Research Investigator, Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
1987-1989	Lecturer, Survey Research Center Summer Program in Survey Research Techniques, University of Michigan.
1986-1987	Visiting Scholar, Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
1985	Lecturer, Department of Psychology, The Ohio State University.
1982-1985	Research Assistant, Center for Political Studies and Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
1980-1981	Senior Research Assistant, Department of Psychology, Harvard University.
1979-1981	Senior Research Assistant, Department of Behavioral Sciences, School of Public Health, Harvard University.
1975-1976	General Manager, The Lawrence (newspaper), The Lawrenceville School.

Honors

1976	Bausch and Lomb Science Award.
1982	National Institute of Mental Health Graduate Training Fellowship.
1984	Phillip Brickman Memorial Prize for Research in Social Psychology.
1984	American Association for Public Opinion Research Student Paper Award.
1984	National Institute of Mental Health Graduate Training Fellowship.
1984	Pi Sigma Alpha Award for the Best Paper Presented at the 1983 Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting.
1984	Elected Departmental Associate, Department of Psychology, University of Michigan, recognizing outstanding academic achievement.
1990	Invited Guest Editor, Social Cognition (Special issue on political psychology, Vol. 8, #1, May)
1993	Brittingham Visiting Scholar, University of Wisconsin.
1995	Erik H. Erikson Early Career Award for Excellence and Creativity in the Field of Political Psychology, International Society of Political Psychology.
1996-1997	Fellow, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, California.
1998	Elected Fellow, American Psychological Association.
1998	Elected Fellow, Society for Personality and Social Psychology.
1998	Elected Fellow, American Psychological Society.
2001-	Appointed University Fellow, Resources for the Future, Washington, DC.
2003	Prize for the Best Paper Presented at the 2002 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Section on Elections, Public Opinion, and Voting Behavior.
2013	Elected Fellow, American Academy of Arts and Sciences.
2010	Elected Fellow, American Association for the Advancement of Science.
2013-2014	Fellow, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, California.
2014	The AAPOR Award, the American Association for Public Opinion Research's lifetime achievement award, given for an outstanding contribution to the field of public opinion research, including: advances in theory, empirical research and methods; improvements in ethical standards; and promotion of understanding among the public, media and/or policy makers.
2014-2015	Consulting Scholar, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, California.

- 2016 The Nevitt Sanford Award from the International Society of Political Psychology, for professional contributions to political psychology, given to someone engaged in the practical application of political psychological principles or creating knowledge that is accessible and used by practitioners to make a positive difference in the way politics is carried out.

Invited Addresses

- 1992 Invited Address, Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- 2003 Invited Address, Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- 2004 Invited Address, Distinguished Lecture Series Sponsored by the Departments of Psychology and Political Science, University of California, Davis, California.
- 2004 Keynote Lecture, International Symposium in Honour of Paul Lazarsfeld, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (Belgium).
- 2005 Invited Address, Joint Program in Survey Methodology Distinguished Lecture Series, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland.
- 2005 Invited Address, “Climate Change: Science → Action”, Conference Hosted by the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, Aspen, Colorado.
- 2005 Invited Commentator, “Science for Valuation of EPA’s Ecological Protection Decisions and Programs,” a U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Science Advisory Board Workshop, Washington, DC.
- 2006 Invited Address, “The Wonderful Willem Saris and his Contributions to the Social Sciences.” Farewell Symposium for Willem Saris, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands.
- 2006 Invited Workshop, “The State of Survey Research.” Annual Summer Meeting of the Society for Political Methodology, Davis, California.
- 2006 Invited Keynote Address, “Recent Lessons Learned About Maximizing Survey Measurement Accuracy in America: One Surprise After Another.” 2006 Survey Research Methodology Conference, Center for Survey Research, Academia Sinica, Taipei, Taiwan.
- 2006 Invited Address, “Review of Nonresponse Analysis Across Multiple Surveys.” Conference on “Sample Representativeness: Implications for Administering and Testing Stated Preference Surveys,” Resources for the Future, Washington, D.C.
- 2006 Invited Address, “Introduction to Survey Issues in Ecological Valuation.” Meeting of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Scientific Advisory Board Committee on Valuing the Protection of Ecological Systems and Services (CVPESS), Washington, D.C.
- 2006 Invited Address, “Gas Pumps and Voting Booths: Energy and Environment in the Midterm Elections.” First Wednesday Seminar, Resources for the Future, Washington, D.C.
- 2006 Invited Address, “What Americans Believe and Don’t Believe about Global Warming: Attitude Formation and Change in Response to a Raging Scientific Controversy.” National Science Foundation Speaker Series, Washington, D.C.

- 2006 Invited Address, “Moving Survey Data Collection to the Internet? Surprising Ways that Mode, Sample Design and Response Rates Affect Survey Accuracy.” New York Chapter of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, Fordham University, New York, New York.
- 2006 Invited Address, “Climate change: What Americans Really Think.” Conference entitled “A Favorable Climate for Climate Action,” sponsored by the Sustainable Silicon Valley, Santa Clara University, Santa Clara, California.
- 2006 Invited Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change: Attitude Formation and Change in Response to a Raging Scientific Controversy.” Brown Bag Series, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Silver Spring, Maryland.
- 2007 Invited Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change: Attitude Formation and Change in Response to a Raging Scientific Controversy.” Education And Outreach Colloquium, Earth Sciences Division, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland.
- 2007 Inaugural Lecture, “The Brave New World of Survey Research: One Surprise After Another.” Survey Research Institute First Annual Speaker Series, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.
- 2007 Inaugural Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change: Attitude Formation and Change in Response to a Raging Scientific Controversy.” National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science/Center for Sponsored Coastal Ocean Research Ecosystem Science Seminar Series & NOS Science Seminar Series, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Silver Spring, Maryland.
- 2007 Plenary Speaker, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change: Attitude Formation and Change in Response to a Raging Scientific Controversy.” Annual Ocean and Coastal Program Managers’ Meeting, Sponsored by the Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management in partnership with the National Estuarine Research Reserve Association, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Washington, DC.
- 2007 Oral Testimony on Assembly Bill 372 (to revise the order in which the names of candidates for an office must appear on the ballot) before the Nevada State Legislature, Carson City, Nevada.
- 2007 Invited Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change: Attitude Formation and Change in Response to a Raging Scientific Controversy.” The White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, Washington, D.C.
- 2007 Invited Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change: Attitude Formation and Change in Response to a Raging Scientific Controversy.” Workshop on Climate Science and Services: Coastal Applications for Decision Making through Sea Grant Extension and Outreach. NOAA Coastal Services Center, Charleston, South Carolina.
- 2007 Invited Lecture, “Climate Change: What Americans Think.” Capitol Hill briefing sponsored by the Environment and Energy Study Institute, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C. Broadcast live on C-SPAN.
- 2007 Invited Lecture, “The Impact of Candidate Name Order on Election Outcomes.” The Carter Center, Atlanta, Georgia.

- 2007 Invited Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change: Attitude Formation and Change in Response to a Raging Scientific Controversy.” Google, Mountain View, California.
- 2007 Invited Lecture, “Climate Change: What Americans Really Think.” The Commonwealth Club, San Francisco, California.
- 2007 Invited Address, “Representativeness of Online Panels.” Time-Warner 2007 Research Conference, New York, New York.
- 2007 Invited Lecture, “What the Public Knows.” News Executives Roundtable: Covering Climate Change, Stanford, California.
- 2007 Invited Address, “The Top Ten Signs of an Excellent Survey Vendor.” Intuit Corporate Customer & Market Insight Offsite, Palo Alto, California.
- 2007 Invited Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change.” Association of Science-Technology Centers Conference, Los Angeles, California.
- 2007 Invited Address, “The New American National Election Study Panel Survey Project.” Survey Research in the 21st Century: Challenges and Opportunities, Royal Statistical Society, London, UK.
- 2007 Invited Testimony, “Aviation Safety: Can NASA Do More to Protect the Public?” House Committee on Science and Technology, U.S. Congress, Washington, DC. Broadcast live on C-SPAN.
- 2007 Invited Opening Keynote Address, “New Insights Into Optimizing Survey Questionnaire Design and Selecting a Model of Data Collection.” Panel Research 2007, ESOMAR World Research Conference, Orlando, Florida.
- 2007 Invited Plenary Address, “New Insights into Questionnaire Design: How to Maximize the Validity of Your Measurements.” Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology Research Conference, Arlington, Virginia.
- 2007 Invited Lecture, “What Americans Think and Do About Climate Change; Insights from a Psychological Perspective.” California Institute for Energy and Environment’s Behavior, Energy, and Climate Change Conference, Sacramento, California.
- 2007 Invited Keynote Lecture, “What Americans Think About Climate Change.” 2007 American Public Media Conference on Sustainability, Pocantico Conference Center, Tarrytown, New York.
- 2007 Invited Address, “What the American Public Really Thinks About Climate Change: New Evidence on Amelioration Strategies.” 2007 American Geophysical Union Fall Meeting, San Francisco, California.
- 2008 Invited Address, “Climate Change and the 2008 U.S. Presidential Election.” Eighth National Conference on Science, Policy, and the Environment: Climate Change: Science and Solutions. Conference sponsored by the National Council for Science and the Environment, Washington, DC.
- 2008 Invited Presentation, “Explaining the Relation of Aging with Susceptibility to Attitude Change.” Eighth Annual SPSP Attitudes Preconference, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

- 2008 Invited Lecture, “Comparisons of Survey Modes in Terms of Data Quality.” Department of Families, Housing, Community Services, and Indigenous Affairs, Australian Government, Canberra, Australia.
- 2008 Invited Lecture, “Applying Theories of Attitudes and Attitude Change to the Mission of the Australian Tax Office.” Australian Tax Office, Australian Government, Canberra, Australia.
- 2008 Invited Lecture, “The Theory of Survey Satisficing.” Tourism Australia, Canberra, Australia.
- 2008 Invited Lecture, “Lessons from the Field: A Blueprint for Optimizing Measurement Accuracy and Sample Composition.” 40th Meeting of the Computer Market Analysis Group, Intuit, Mountain View, California.
- 2008 Invited Lecture, “Uses of Surveys in Court.” How to Find, Litigate, and Try Class Action Lawsuits, Educational Symposium sponsored by Consumer Attorneys of San Diego, San Diego, California.
- 2008 Invited Keynote Address, “What the American Public Really Thinks About Climate Change: New Evidence on Amelioration Strategies.” Union of Concerned Scientists Retreat, National Labor College, Silver Spring, Maryland.
- 2008 Invited Lecture, “The Challenges of Measuring Facts Accurately in Surveys: Small Changes in Question Wording can Make a Difference.” Survey Methodology Division, U.S. Census Bureau, Suitland, Maryland.
- 2008 Invited Lecture, “The Accuracy of Non-Probability Samples of People Who Volunteer to Do Surveys for Money.” Harvard Center for Survey Research 2008 Spring Conference: New Technologies and Survey Research, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- 2008 Invited Presentation, “Writing an Effective Grant Proposal for NSF.” AAPOR Professional Development Breakfast. Annual Meeting of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- 2008 Invited Commentary, “Reflections on the American Voter Revisited.” Annual Meeting of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- 2008 Invited Presentation, “Briefing on the NAOMS Survey Creation.” Presentation to the Committee to Assess NASA’s National Aviation Operations Monitoring Service (NAOMS) Project, National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, DC.
- 2008 Invited Address, “Public Attitudes, Perceptions, and Concern about Global Warming: Evidence from a New Survey.” Lecture at the Russell Senate Office Building in the Environmental Science Seminar Series Sponsored by the American Meteorological Society, Washington, D.C.
- 2008 Invited Keynote Address, “Designing Ballots to Prevent Bias: How the Order of Candidate Names Determines Who Was Elected President.” EVT ’08, 2008 Usenix/Accurate Electronic Voting Technology Workshop, San Jose, California.
- 2008 Invited Address, “What Americans Think about Climate Change: Insights from 10 Years of Psychology-Inspired National Surveys Tracking Public Attitudes.” Symposium on the

Psychology of Global Climate Change, American Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts.

- 2008 Invited Presentation, “The Accuracy of On-line Surveys with Non-Probability Samples.” Second Annual Workshop on Measurement and Experimentation with Internet Panels, Sponsored by CentERdata, Institute for Data Collection and Research (University of Tilburg), Zeist, The Netherlands.
- 2008 Invited Address, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change: Is it Happening? What’s Causing it? What Should Be Done About It?” Conference entitled “Social Science and Humanities Facing the Climate Change Challenges,” sponsored by the European Union, the Republic of France, the French Ministère de L’Enseignement Supérieur Et De La Recherche, and the French Ministère De L’Ecologie, De L’Energie, Du Développement Durable, Et De L’Aménagement du Territoire, Paris, France.
- 2008 Invited Presentation, “Susceptibility to Response Effects in Surveys: Cognitive and Motivational Factors.” Seventh International Conference on Social Science Methodology – RC33 – Logic and Methodology in Sociology, Naples, Italy.
- 2008 Invited Presentation, “Satisficing When Answering Questions: A Theoretical Explanation for a Wide Range of Findings in the Questionnaire Design Literature.” Max Planck Institute for Human Development, Berlin, Germany.
- 2008 Invited Presentation, “Social Psychology Under the Microscope: Do Classic Laboratory Experiments Replicate When Participants Are Representative of the General Public Rather Than Convenience Samples of College Students?” Max Planck Institute for Human Development, Berlin, Germany.
- 2008 Fathauer Lecturer, “How Do American Voters Decide? Findings from Fifty Years of Scholarship on Electoral Choice.” Eller College of Management, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona.
- 2008 Invited Presentation, “What Are They Thinking? Information, Persuasion, and the American Public’s Response to Climate Change.” American Politics Research Workshop, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- 2008 Invited Presentation, “The 2008 American Presidential Election: Psychological Insights from the AP-Yahoo News Poll.” Society of Experimental Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Sacramento, California.
- 2008 Invited Presentation, “Election Preview: Polls, Ballots, Fraud, and Misconceptions.” 46th Annual New Horizons in Science Conference, Council for the Advancement of Science Writing, Palo Alto, California.
- 2008 Invited Presentation, “Getting Into the Heads of American Voters: Insights from Political Psychology.” Menlo School, Menlo Park, California.
- 2008 Invited Lecture, “Do We Really Care About Climate Change? Grounding Climate Policy in Psychological Analysis.” The World Bank, Washington, DC.
- 2008 Invited Lecture, “Issue-Focused Passion in America: How and Why Issue Publics Determine Election Outcomes.” Seminario de Investigación en Ciencia Política 2008, *Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México (ITAM)*, Mexico City, Mexico.

- 2009 Invited Presentation, “Accounting for Biases in NAOMS.” Presentation to the Committee to Assess NASA’s National Aviation Operations Monitoring Service (NAOMS) Project, National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences, NASA Ames Conference Center, Moffett Field, California.
- 2009 Presidential Symposium Lecture, “Why the 2008 U.S. Presidential Election Turned Out As It Did: Psychology Peers Into National Survey Data.” Annual Meeting of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Tampa, Florida.
- 2009 Stauffer Colloquium Series Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change: Attitude Formation and Change in Response to a Raging Scientific Controversy.” School of Behavioral and Organizational Sciences, Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, California.
- 2009 RTI Fellow Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change: Psychological Insights from 10 Years of National Surveys.” RTI International, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina.
- 2009 Walter H. Stellner Distinguished Speaker in Marketing, “Social Psychology Under the Microscope: Do Our Classic Experiments Replicate When Participants Are Representative of the General Public Rather Than Convenience Samples of College Students?” College of Business, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, Illinois.
- 2009 Invited Presentation, “Mediation: Why Bother?” Twelfth Sydney Symposium of Social Psychology entitled “Attitudes and Attitude Change.” University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia.
- 2009 Keynote Address, “Money for Surveys: What about Data Quality?” GOR 09, 11th General Online Research Conference, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria.
- 2009 Invited Presentation, “Comparing Various Measures of Survey Accuracy and Summarizing the Findings of Studies Using Each Method.” Conference on Survey Quality, Program on Survey Research, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- 2009 Invited Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change: Attitude Formation and Change in Response to a Raging Scientific Controversy.” Climate Policy Seminar Series, sponsored by the Climate Risk Management Initiative, Dickinson School of Law, the Environment & Natural Resources Institute, the Penn State Institute of Energy and the Environment, the Rock Ethics Institute, Communication Arts and Sciences, Department of Political Science, Department of Psychology, Schreyer Institute for Teaching Excellence, and the Social Science Research Institute, Pennsylvania State University.
- 2009 Invited Lecture, “The Accuracy of Online Surveys with Non-probability Samples of People who Volunteer to do Surveys for Money.” Center for Statistics and the Social Sciences Seminar, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.
- 2009 Allen Edwards Endowed Lecture in Psychology, “Social Psychology Under the Microscope: Do Classic Experiments Replicate when Participates are Representative of the General Public Rather Than Convenience Samples of College Students?” Department of Psychology, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.
- 2009 Invited Lecture, “Why I Challenged the NASA Administrator in Congressional Testimony: The Shocking Story of a Groundbreaking Aviation Safety Survey Research Project Gone Awry.” Google Tech Talk Series, Mountain View, California.

- 2009 Invited Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change: Attitude Formation and Change in Response to a Raging Scientific Controversy.” Climate Central, Princeton, New Jersey.
- 2009 Invited Plenary Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change: Attitude Formation and Change in Response to a Raging Scientific Controversy.” A National Workshop on Communicating Ocean Issues Based on Ocean on the Edge: Top Ocean Issues. Long Beach Convention Center, sponsored by the Aquarium of the Pacific, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the National Research Council’s Marine Board and Ocean Studies Board, Long Beach, California.
- 2009 Invited Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change.” Air Resources Board Chair’s Air Pollution Seminar, California Environmental Protection Agency Building, Sacramento, California.
- 2009 Invited Presentation, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change.” Stanford University Alumni Association – Sacramento Chapter. Sacramento, California.
- 2009 Keynote Address, “The End of Agree/Disagree Rating Scales: Acquiescence Bias and Other Flaws Suggest a Popular Measurement Method Should Be Abandoned.” European Survey Research Association 2009 Conference, Warsaw, Poland.
- 2009 Invited Lecture, “Methods of Survey Data Collection and Determinants of Data Quality.” German Research Foundation Summer Academy on Methods of Educational Research, University of Bamberg, Bamberg, Germany.
- 2009 Invited Panel Member, “Hopenhagen: Public support for a climate deal in Copenhagen.” The Commonwealth Club of California, San Francisco, California.
- 2009 Invited Primary Paper Presentation, “Conducting Experiments to Evaluate Questions.” Workshop on Question Evaluation Methods, National Center for Health Statistics, Hyattsville, Maryland.
- 2009 Invited Presentation, “The Use of Surveys in Court.” Second Annual Class Action Symposium Sponsored by Consumer Attorneys of San Diego, San Diego, California.
- 2009 Invited Presentation, “The Accuracy of Internet Surveys.” Attaining Accuracy, Maximum Coverage, and Representative in Web-Based Research. Conference at the Charles Hotel, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- 2009 Keynote Address, “Scientific Survey Research: Sustainable in an Online World?” CASRO Data Collection Conference, Council of American Survey Research Organizations, Las Vegas, Nevada.
- 2009 Invited Webinar, “Best Practice Data Collection Online with a Probability Sample?” Australian Market & Social Research Society, Sydney, Australia.
- 2010 Invited Presentation, “A New Look at Racism in America: Evidence from National Surveys.” Political Psychology Pre-Conference 2010, Society for Personality and Social Psychology Annual Conference, Las Vegas, Nevada.
- 2010 Invited Presentation, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change: Attitude Formation and Change in Response to a Raging Scientific Controversy.” Stanford Club of Las Vegas, Las Vegas, Nevada.

- 2010 Invited Address, “Tracking American Opinions About Climate Change.” Climate, Mind, and Behavior Symposium, The Garrison Institute, Garrison, New York.
- 2010 Invited Presentation, “Public Opinion and Climate Change: The Real Reason for the Recent Decline.” Climate Policy: Public Perception, Science, and the Political Landscape. Sponsored by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Geophysical Union, the American Meteorological Society, and the American Statistical Association. Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.
- 2010 Invited Lecture, “Creating and Evaluating a new Method for Collecting Survey Data via the Internet: The Story of the FFRISP (Face-to-Face Recruited Internet Survey Platform)”. Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences Lecture Series, National Science Foundation, Arlington, Virginia.
- 2014 Invited Lecture, “Recent Research Findings from SRS Experiments.” Science Resources Statistics Program Colloquium, National Science Foundation, Arlington, Virginia.
- 2010 Invited Lecture, “What Americans Think About Climate Change.” Speaker Series, Center for Decision Sciences, Columbia University, New York, New York.
- 2010 Invited Lecture, “Social Psychology Under the Microscope: Do Our Classic Experiments Replicate When Participants Are Representative of the General Public Rather Than Convenience Samples of College Students?” Colloquium Series, Psychology Department, Columbia University, New York, New York.
- 2010 Invited Lecture, “Public Opinion Research on Climate Change.” Rio Tinto Workshop on the Politics of Carbon, Meridian Institute, Washington, DC.
- 2010 Invited Lecture, “How to Measure Usability: Designing Your Questions Well.” Washington, DC, Chapter of the Usability Professionals’ Association, Arlington, Virginia.
- 2010 Invited Lecture, “Have Americans’ Views on Global Warming Changed? A New Look at Public Opinion.” Briefing sponsored by the Environmental and Energy Study Institute, Capital Visitor Center, Washington, DC.
- 2010 Invited Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change.” Climate Change Communication Forum, Hosted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the U.S. Department of the Interior, George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia.
- 2010 Invited Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change.” Clean Energy Program, Third Way, Washington, DC.
- 2010 Invited Lectures, “Experimental Methods in the Social Sciences.” Workshop in Experimental Methods, Sponsored by the ELECDDEM Training Network in Electoral Democracy, ICHEC, Brussels, Belgium.
- 2010 Invited Lecture, “Optimizing Survey Questionnaire Design: New Findings.” Interagency Response Error Group Monthly Meeting, Government Accountability Office, Washington, DC.
- 2010 Invited Lecture, “Creating and Evaluating a New Method for Collecting Survey Data via the Internet,” Workshop sponsored by DC-AAPOR, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, DC.

- 2010 Keynote Address, “Surveys and Statistical Evidence to Mange the Class Case”. Third Annual Class Action Symposium, San Diego, California.
- 2010 Invited Presentation, “Implicit Attitude Measurement in National Surveys.” Conference on Methodology in Political Psychology, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
- 2010 Invited Presentation, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change,” MZES Colloquium, Mannheimer Zentrum Fur Europäische Sozialforschung, University of Mannheim, Mannheim, Germany.
- 2010 Invited Workshop, “Attitudes in the World of Politics: Formation, Change, and Impact.” Oberrhein-Program (cosponsored by the Universities of Mannheim, Heidelberg, Freiberg, and Basel), Social Sciences Graduate School, University of Mannheim, Mannheim, Germany.
- 2010 Lunchtime Brownbag Series, “Assessing Anti-Black Racism in Contemporary America via Surveys: New Measurement Approaches Yield New Insights.” National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.
- 2010 Invited Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change.” AAAS Leadership Seminar in Science and Technology Policy, American Association for the Advancement of Science, Washington, DC.
- 2010 Invited Panelist, “Outlook for Climate and Energy Policy in the New Congress,” Session in the “Science & Society: Global Challenges Discussion Series”, Center for Science, Technology and Security Policy, American Association for the Advancement of Science, Washington, DC.
- 2010 Invited Guest Speaker, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change.” World Resources Institute, Washington, DC.
- 2010 Invited Presentation to the Working Group on Immigration and Cultural Contact, “The Accuracy of Internet Surveys with Probability and Non-Probability Samples.” Russell Sage Foundation, New York, New York.
- 2010 Invited Lecture, “What Mainers Really Think About Global Warming: Results from an In-Depth Statewide Survey.” Environmental Studies Program, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine.
- 2010 Invited Panelist, “Reflections on the Accomplishments and Future of Political Communication Research.” Conference on “Political Communication: The State of the Field in the 21st Century.” Annenberg Public Policy Center, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- 2010 Invited Presentation, “The American Public’s Understandings and Misunderstandings About Climate Change: Is There a Crisis of Confidence in Climate Science?” Scientific Symposium in Honor of Stephen H. Schneider, Stanford University, Stanford, California.
- 2011 Invited Lecture, “What Floridians Really Think About Global Warming: Results from an In-Depth Statewide Survey.” Lecture hosted by the FSU Department of Earth, Ocean, and Atmospheric Science, the FSU Department of Urban and Regional Planning, the Florida Climate Institute, the Tallahassee Democrat, and the FSU Institute for Energy Systems, Economics, and Sustainability, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida.

- 2011 Invited Presentation, “The Mega-Splice in the 2008 American National Election Studies Time Series Survey.” Design Issues in Longitudinal and Repeated Cross-Sectional Surveys. Duke Initiative on Survey Methodology. Social Science Research Institute at Duke University, Durham, North Carolina.
- 2011 Invited Presentation, “What Americans Think About Global Warming: Attitude Formation and Change in Response to a Raging Scientific Controversy.” Monterey Bay Aquarium, Monterey, California.
- 2011 Invited Testimony, Comments on Assembly Bill No. 99 “Revises the Order in Which the Names of Candidates for an Office Must Appear on the Ballot”, Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections, Nevada Assembly, State of Nevada.
- 2015 Invited Discussant on Respondent Motivation, BLUE-Enterprise and Trade Statistics Conference on Business’ Burden and Motivation in Official Surveys. Conference sponsored by Statistics Netherlands and the European Union, Heerlen, The Netherlands.
- 2011 Invited Presentation, “What Massachusetts Residents and Other Americans Think About Climate Change: Results from an In-Depth Statewide Study and National Surveys.” Boston University, Boston Massachusetts.
- 2011 Invited Presentation, “What Massachusetts Residents and Other Americans Think About Climate Change: Results from an In-Depth Statewide Study and National Surveys.” The Heller School for Social Policy and Management, Brandeis University, Waltham, Massachusetts.
- 2011 Invited Presentation, “What Massachusetts Residents and Other Americans Think About Climate Change: Results from an In-Depth Statewide Study and National Surveys.” Green Conversation Series, Harvard University Center for the Environment, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- 2011 Invited Presentation, “What Massachusetts Residents and Other Americans Think About Climate Change: Results from an In-Depth Statewide Study and National Surveys.” Tufts Institute of the Environment, Tufts University, Medford, Massachusetts.
- 2011 Invited Presentation, “Adventures in Survey Research: A Workshop on the Dangers of Trying to Make the World a Better Place through Social Science.” Essex Short Course in Social Research, in Association with Methodology Institute LSE and IPSOS MORI, University of Essex, Essex, United Kingdom.
- 2013 Invited Presentation, “Measuring Intent to Participate and Participation in the 2010 Census and Their Correlates and Trends: Comparisons of RDD Telephone and Non-probability Sample Internet Survey Data.” U.S. Census Bureau, Suitland, Maryland.
- 2011 Invited Remarks, “Studying the Impact of Electoral Impact of Candidate Statements on Policy Issues.” Session entitled “Studying 2012 Campaign and elections: Current Plans and Future Directions,” sponsored by the Omidyar Network and the National Institute for Civil Discourse at the University of Arizona. American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Seattle, Washington.
- 2011 Invited Presentation, “Social Psychology Under the Microscope: Do Our Classic Experiments Replicate When Participants Are Representative of the General Public Rather

Than Convenience Samples of College Students?” A Conference in Honor of Daniel Wegner, Harvard Business School, Harvard University.

- 2011 Invited Presentation, “American Public Opinion on Climate Change and Its Impact on Voting in Congressional and Presidential Elections.” Public lecture and webcast sponsored by Resources for the Future, Washington, D.C.
- 2011 Invited Webinar, “Advances in Questionnaire Design.” Australian Market & Social Research Society, Sydney, Australia.
- 2011 Invited Lecture, “Passion in American Politics: What Happens When Citizens Become Deeply Committed to Pressuring Government on a Policy Issue.” MZE-Colloquium, School of Social Sciences, University of Mannheim, Mannheim, Germany.
- 2011 Invited Lecture, “Creating the Face-to-Face Recruited Internet Survey Platform (FFRISP).” Collaborative Research Center, University of Mannheim, Mannheim, Germany.
- 2012 Invited Lecture, “Trends in American Public Attitudes about Global Warming: A Psychological Analysis.” Sustainability Psychology Preconference, Society for Personality and Social Psychology Annual Meeting, San Diego, California.
- 2012 Invited Lecture, “Americans’ Views on Climate Change and Their Impact on Voting Behavior.” 2012 Climate, Mind, and Behavior Symposium, Garrison Institute, Garrison, New York.
- 2014 Invited Presentation, “Changing Government Policy by Changing Public Attitudes.” Climate Central, Princeton, New Jersey.
- 2012 Invited Presentation, “Americans’ Views on Climate Change and Their Impact on Voting Behavior.” Skoll Global Threats Fund, San Francisco, California.
- 2012 Invited Presentation, “What Americans Think About Climate Change.” Webinar series on The Science of Policy Communication. Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues.
- 2012 Invited Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change.” Lecture sponsored by the Water Sustainability Program, the Institute of the Environment, the Renewable Energy Network, the School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, and the School of Geography and Development, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona.
- 2012 Invited Lecture, “Trust in Scientists, Controversy Among Scientists, and American Public Opinion on Climate Change: How Attitude Formation and Change Unfold.” Presentation during “The Science of Science Communication”, The Arthur M. Sackler Colloquia, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, DC.
- 2012 Invited Short Course, “Maximizing the Accuracy of Online Surveys: Comparisons of Methods and Recommendations of Optimal Procedures.” American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Orlando, Florida.
- 2012 Invited Lecture, “How Americans Form and Change Their Opinions About Climate Change.” Outside-In Engagement Series sponsored by the Interagency Communication and Education Team, United States Global Change Research Program, Washington, DC.
- 2012 Invited Lecture, “Pursuing Excellence in Scientific Research: Challenges and Rewards.”

Second Annual Stanford University Postdoctoral Association Research Symposium,
Stanford University, Stanford, California.

- 2012 Invited Lecture, “U.S. Public Views on Climate Change: Insights from Polling.” Program on Communicating Uncertainty, Institute for International and Regional Studies, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey.
- 2012 Invited Keynote, “Public perceptions of Climate Change in the U.S.” Planning for Local Government Climate Challenges: Connecting Research and Practice Workshop, Sponsored by the University of Arizona Institute of the Environment, Arizona State University Campus, Tempe, Arizona.
- 2012 Invited Presentation, “Optimizing the Design of Self-Reports.” Engagement and Academic Tenacity: Making the Invisible Salient and Actionable, Workshop Sponsored by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- 2012 Invited Presentation, “Evidence of Decline in Effect Sizes: From Original Studies to Replications to Representative National Samples.” The Decline Effect: Evidence, Explanations, and Future Directions. Symposium at the University of California Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, California.
- 2012 Invited Presentation, “Has the American Public Turned Away from Climate Change?” Salon Sponsored by the Woods Institute for the Environment at Stanford University, Venice, California.
- 2012 Invited Presentation, “Questionnaire Design.” Conference on the Future of Survey Research, National Science Foundation, Arlington, Virginia.
- 2012 Invited Speaker, “What’s at Stake for California?” Event sponsored by the Division of Social Sciences, the Office of Government Relations, and the Politics Department, University of California - Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz, California.
- 2012 Invited Presentation, “Issue Publics and Candidate Evaluations; Contrasting Different Analytic Methods to Identify the Psychological Process of Candidate Evaluation.” Directions in Political Science: Papers in Honor of George B. Rabinowitz. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- 2012 Invited Lecture, “What Americans Think About Climate Change: Explorations of Attitude and Belief Formation and Change in Response to a Raging Controversy”, Lecture Series on Persuasion, Attitude, and Behavior Change, Sponsored by the Research Center for Group Dynamics, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
- 2013 Invited Keynote Address, “The Future of Survey Research,” Survey Research Methodology: The Changing Landscape of Survey Research in the Field and at ICF. Conference sponsored by ICF International, Fairfax, Virginia.
- 2013 Invited Lecture, “The Future of Survey Research,” 2013 National Cancer Institute Division of Cancer Control and Population Sciences Workshop: Global and National Issues Shaping the Cancer Control Surveillance Landscape. NIH Neuroscience Conference Center, Rockville, Maryland.
- 2013 Invited Lecture, “Public Perceptions about Global Warming and Government Involvement in the Issue.” Briefing at the Rayburn House Office Building, sponsored by the Environmental and Energy Study Institute, Washington, DC.

- 2013 Policy Briefing, “Preparing for the Effects of Global Warming: The American Public’s Perspective on Sea Level Rise,” National Press Club, sponsored by the Woods Institute for the Environment at Stanford University and the Center for Ocean Solutions at Stanford University, Washington, DC.
- 2013 Invited Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change - Attitude Formation and Change Across the U.S. in Response to a Raging Scientific Controversy.” Sponsored by the “Middle America” Student Organization, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- 2013 Invited Remarks, “RFF University Fellows Roundtable: RFF’s Next Decade.” Resources for the Future, Washington, DC.
- 2013 Invited Lecture, “The American Public’s Views of Climate Change: An Update.” Department of Global Ecology, Carnegie Institution for Science, Stanford, California.
- 2013 Invited Lecture, “Contingent Valuation.” Lecture sponsored by the Centre for Environmental Political Sciences, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden.
- 2013 Invited Lecture, “The Accuracy of Online Surveys with Non-probability Samples of People who Volunteer to Do Surveys for Money.” Workshop on Survey Methodology, Multidisciplinary Opinion and Democracy Research Group, Department of Political Science, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden.
- 2013 Invited Lecture, “Satisficing When Answering Questions: A Theoretical Explanation for a Wide Range of Findings in the Questionnaire Design Literature.” Workshop on Survey Methodology, Multidisciplinary Opinion and Democracy Research Group, Department of Political Science, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden.
- 2013 Invited Lecture, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change: Attitude Formation and Change in Response to a Raging Scientific Controversy.” Sponsored by the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden.
- 2013 Invited Lecture, “Trust in Environmental Scientists and Public Opinion on Global Warming in the United States.” Presentation at the Breakfast Seminar on Climate and Opinion, sponsored by the Bergen Programme for Governance and Climate, Uni Rokkan Center, Bergen, Norway.
- 2013 Invited Lecture, “Survey Item Design.” Workshop on Survey Design for the Norwegian Citizen Panel, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway.
- 2013 Invited Presentation, “American Public Opinion on Climate Change.” Conference on “What is the Value of Being First? Perspectives from the California and Sweden Experiences.” Climate Policy Forum co-sponsored by Resources for the Future, the Swedish Mistra Indigo program, and the ClimateWorks Foundation. Hyatt Regency Embarcadero, San Francisco, California.
- 2013 Invited Lecture, “The Psychology of American Public Opinion on Climate Change.” Symposium on Conservation Psychology, hosted by the University of Southern California Environmental Sustainability Network, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California.
- 2013 Invited Keynote Presentation, “The History of Panel Internet Surveys.” Workshop on

Longitudinal Research in Internet Panels, Program on Political Economy of Reforms, University of Mannheim, Mannheim, Germany.

- 2013 Invited Presentation, “Mode Comparisons.” Workshop on Longitudinal Research in Internet Panels, Program on Political Economy of Reforms, University of Mannheim, Mannheim, Germany.
- 2013 Short Course (with Mario Callegaro), “How to Publish in Survey Research: Strategies, Venues, Opportunities, and Errors to Avoid.” American Association for Public Research Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts.
- 2013 Invited Keynote Address, “The Accuracy of Survey Measurements and the Impact of Data Collection Methodology.” Canadian Political Science Association, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada.
- 2013 Invited Presentation, “Debiasing.” Conference on Risk Communication for Better Long-Term Decisions: Insights from Finance and Healthcare. CenSoC - Centre for the Study of Choice, University of Technology, Sydney, Sydney, Australia.
- 2013 Invited Webinar (with Arthur Lupia and Matthew K. Berent), “Survey Coding: Best Practices for Coding Open-Ended Survey Data.” Webinar sponsored by the American Association for Public Opinion Research.
- 2013 Invited Keynote Address, “The Accuracy of Survey Data Collected by Various American On-line Survey Firms: A 2012 Comparison.” MESS Workshop, Sponsored by the University of Tilburg CentERdata Institute for Data Collection and Research, Den Haag, The Netherlands.
- 2013 Invited Keynote Address, “Social Desirability Response Bias: Real or an Illusion?” Sixth Webdatanet MC, WGs, TFs, Seminars, Webdatametrics Workshop and Conference: “Mixed Mode and Multi-Mode Research.” Sponsored by the Universitatis Islandiae Sigillum, Reykjavik, Iceland.
- 2013 Invited Keynote Address, “Choosing Mode of Data Collection for Surveys to Maximuze Data Quality.” International Conference on Applied Statistics 2013, Ribno, Slovenia.
- 2013 Invited Address, “Online Surveys.” DSA2 Conference on Web Surveys, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia.
- 2013 Invited Address, “The Effects of Scientists’ Expressions of Uncertainty on Public Opinion on Global Warming.” Australian Psychological Society Annual Meeting, Cairns Convention Centre, Queensland, Australia.
- 2013 Invited Presentation, “Inequality in Public Conversations about Politics.” Cottrell Salon, Stanford, California.
- 2013 Invited Webinar, “Communicating About Climate Adaptation with the Public.” Sponsored by the Center for Ocean Solutions and the Woods Institute for the Environment, Stanford University.
- 2013 Invited Testimony, “Public Opinion on Global Warming in the States.” Bicameral Task Force on Climate Change, Committee on Energy and Commerce, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

- 2013 Invited Presentation, “Public Opinion on Global Warming in the States.” Climate Action Campaign, Washington, DC.
- 2013 Invited Short Course, “Maximizing the Accuracy of Online Surveys: Comparisons of Methods and Recommendations of Optimal Procedures.” Annual Meeting of the Pacific Chapter of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, San Francisco, California.
- 2013 Invited Keynote Address, “Public Perceptions of Climate Change in the U.S.” Regional Climate Summit for Municipal Leaders: Economic, Health, Water, and Transportation Impacts. Sponsored by Climate Assessment for the Southwest, University of Arizona. University Marriott, Tucson, Arizona.
- 2014 Invited Presentation, “The Quality of Data Obtained from Non-Probability Internet Panels.” Google, Mountain View, California.
- 2014 Invited Presentation, “Satisficing When Answering Questions: A Theoretical Explanation for a Wide Range of Findings in the Questionnaire Design Literature.” CORE Colloquium Series, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas.
- 2014 Invited Presentation, “Public Opinion on Global Warming.” Connecting the Dots Conference, Sponsored by the Woods Institute for the Environment, Stanford University, Stanford, California.
- 2014 Invited Keynote Address, “The Future of Survey Research.” Survey Research in the 21st Century: Lectures Celebrating the Survey Research Laboratory’s 50th Anniversary, University of Illinois, Champaign, Illinois.
- 2014 Invited Keynote Address, “The Future of Survey Research.” Survey Research in the 21st Century: Lectures Celebrating the Survey Research Laboratory’s 50th Anniversary, University of Illinois, Chicago, Illinois.
- 2014 Invited Webinar, “Experiments in Surveys: Tools for Determining How Marketers Can Shape People’s Preferences.” Australian Market & Social Research Society, Sydney, Australia.
- 2014 Invited Keynote Presentation, “Conducting and Publishing Methodology Research.” Annual Meeting of the Association of Academic Survey Research Organizations, University of Illinois, Chicago, Illinois.
- 2014 Invited Lecture, “Climate Change and Clean Energy – A Survey of U.S. Public Attitudes.” Resources for the Future, Washington, DC.
- 2014 Invited Presentation, “Public Attitudes About Climate Change and Clean Energy.” Sponsored by the Environmental and Energy Study Institute, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.
- 2014 Invited Presentation, “Social Science as Combat: The Global Warming War.” Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Palo Alto, California.
- 2014 Invited Keynote Address, “The Future of Survey Research.” World Association of Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Universidad Diego Portales, Santiago, Chile.
- 2014 Invited Presentation, “American Public Opinion on Global Warming.” S. D. Bechtel, Jr.

Foundation. San Francisco, California.

- 2014 Invited Presentation, “The Future of Survey Research.” IJMR Speaker Evening, Market Research Society, London, U.K.
- 2014 Invited Presentation, “Impact of the Merchants of Doubt and of Natural Scientists on American Public Opinion on Global Warming.” Conference entitled “Responding and Adapting to Climate Change: Recognizing and managing Uncertainty in the Physical, Social, and Public Spheres.” University of Bristol, Bristol, U.K.
- 2014 Invited Presentation, “Comments on Variables that Determine the Quality of Survey Responses.” ESS-DACE Quality Enhancement Meeting Entitled “Measurement Quality in the ESS”. Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, Spain.
- 2014 Invited Presentation, “The Future of Survey Research.” ESS Seminar: Highlights in Survey Research, Campus de la Ciutadella of Universitat Pampeu Fabra, Barcenola, Spain.
- 2014 Invited Presentation “Inequality and Public Opinion on Global Warming.” Institute for the Study of Societal Issues, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, California.
- 2014 Invited Presentation, “The Role of Americans’ Attitudes on Global Warming in Political Campaigns.” Harris School for Public Policy, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.
- 2014 Invited Keynote Address, “Exploring the Origins of Beliefs about Climate Change: Experimental Studies Embedded in National Surveys of the U.S.” The Norwegian Citizen Panel Conference 2014, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway.
- 2015 Invited Keynote Address, “Optimizing the Design of Survey Questionnaires.” Rethink Research: Research Intensification Series, sponsored by the Social Science Research Laboratories, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatchewan, Canada.
- 2015 Invited Presentation, “American Public Opinion on Climate Change: Motivated Cognition?” Harvard University Center for the Environment, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- 2015 Invited Presentation, “Sampling on the Internet for Surveys and Experiments; The Good, the Bad, and he Ugly.” Data Gathering Methods Study Group, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia.
- 2015 Invited Presentation, “Can Surveys Measure Informed Public Preferences Regarding Government Policies? An Evaluation of the Contingent Valuation Method.” Quantitative Collaborative, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia.
- 2015 Invited Presentation, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change: Attitude Formation and Change in Response to a Raging Scientific Controversy.” Center for Survey Research, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia.
- 2015 Invited Presentation, “Causes of Turnout.” Conference entitled “How Voters Think: Lessons from Science and Practice.” A meeting of political scientists with Democratic Party campaign consultants. Harris School of Public Policy, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.
- 2015 Invited Presentation, “Communicating about Climate Change: How Language Choices Affect Public Thinking.” Sunnylands Speaker Series at Rancho Mirage Library, Rancho

Mirage, California.

- 2015 Invited Presentation, “The Impact of Acknowledging Bounded and Unbounded Uncertainty on Persuasion: The Case of Scientific Uncertainty and Global Warming.” Conference entitled “Third Annual UCSB Environmental Political Conference. UCSB Center for Social Solutions to Environmental Problems, Bren School of Environmental Science and Management, University of California, Santa Barbara, California.
- 2015 Invited Presentation, “Fact-Checking and News Literacy.” Annual Journalism Funders Gathering: “Journalism, Democracy, and Political Polarization.” William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, Menlo Park, California.
- 2015 Invited Presentation, “Causes of Turnout.” Conference entitled “How Voters Think: Lessons from Science and Practice.” A meeting of political scientists with Republican Party campaign consultants. Harris School of Public Policy, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.
- 2015 Invited Lecture, “*Social Psychology Under the Microscope: Do Our Classic Experiments Replicate When Participants Are Representative of the General Public Rather Than Convenience Samples of College Students?*” Lecture sponsored by the Quantitative Initiative for Policy and Social Research, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky.
- 2015 Invited Lecture, “*Political Thinking, Passion and Action in America: The Contributions of Jon Krosnick to the Study of Political Psychology.*” Lecture sponsored by the Quantitative Initiative for Policy and Social Research, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky.
- 2015 Invited Presentation, “What Americans Really Think About Global Warming.” Invited Lecture in the Distinguished Speaker Series, Department of Political Science, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia.
- 2015 Invited Remarks, “Samuel Popkin: Celebration of a Remarkable Career.” Institute of the Americas, University of California, San Diego, California.
- 2015 Invited Lecture, “The Influence of the Media.” Academic Department of Political Science, Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México, Mexico City, Mexico.
- 2015 Invited Workshop, “Developments in Survey Research Methodology.” Academic Department of Political Science, Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México, Mexico City, Mexico.
- 2015 Invited Remarks, “Pre-election Polling in the United States.” Foro El Panorama Internacional Sobre El Papel de las Encuestas Electorales. México Instituto Nacional Electoral, Mexico, City, Mexico.
- 2015 Keynote Address, “How Accurate Are Surveys and What Can We Do to Maximize Accuracy.” Annual Conference of the Midwest Association for Public Opinion Research, Chicago, Illinois.
- 2015 Invited Presentation, “What Americans Really Think about Climate Change - Attitude Formation and Change in Response to a Raging Scientific Controversy.” UCCS Speaker Series, University of California Center, Sacramento, California.
- 2015 Invited Presentation, “Reasons to worry about social sciences and opportunities for improvement.” Improving Biomedical Research 2015: Challenges and Solutions. Meta-

Research Innovation Center at Stanford, Stanford University, Stanford, California.

- 2015 Invited Presentation, “Giving the Public a Voice in the Process of Democratic Policy Making.” Society of Experiment Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Denver, Colorado.
- 2016 Invited Presentation, “The Future of Internet Surveys: Why Bother with Random Sampling?” The Inaugural Ross-Royall Symposium: From Individuals to Populations. Department of Biostatistics, Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.
- 2016 Invited Lecture, “Collapses of Research Integrity and Opportunities to Strengthen Science.” Lecture sponsored by the Office of Research Integrity, University of California, Riverside, Riverside, California.
- 2016 Invited Presentation, “Public Opinion on Climate Change.” Presentation at the California Association of Museums Annual Meeting, Riverside, California.
- 2016 2016 Gierach Lectureship, “Passion in American Politics: What Happens When Citizens Become Deeply Committed to Pressuring Government on a Policy Issue.” Department of Psychology, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.
- 2016 Invited Colloquium, “Best Practices in Science: Profound Problems and Wonderful Opportunities for Psychologists.” Department of Psychology, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.
- 2016 Invited Keynote Address, “Can Surveys Measure Informed Public Preferences Regarding Government Policies? An Evaluation of the Contingent Valuation Method.” Conference on Political Communication, Conflict, Journalism, Public Opinion, Discourse, and Psychological Perspectives. Noah Mozes Department of Communication and Journalism and the Smart Family Institute of Communication, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel.
- 2016 Invited Keynote Address, “Reflections on an Extraordinary Career; Elihu Katz and the Study of Mass Communication and Public Opinion.” Conference on Political Communication, Conflict, Journalism, Public Opinion, Discourse, and Psychological Perspectives. Noah Mozes Department of Communication and Journalism and the Smart Family Institute of Communication, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel.
- 2016 Invited Presentation, “What Americans Really Think About Climate Change. Presentation sponsored by the Stanford Alumni Association. Greenberg Traurig Law Firm, Tel Aviv, Israel.
- 2016 Invited Presentation, “Best Practices in Science: Profound Problems and Wonderful Opportunities for Social and Behavioral Scientists.” Department of Communication, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel.
- 2016 Invited Lecture, “The Impact of Survey Mode and Sampling on the Accuracy of Survey Results.” Federal Trade Commission, Washington, DC.
- 2016 Invited Lecture, “Can Surveys Measure Informed Public Preferences Regarding Government Policies? An Evaluation of the Contingent Valuation Method.” GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences, Mannheim, Germany.
- 2016 Invited lecture, “Impact of Survey Modes.” Workshop on Survey Mode Effects, Sponsored

by the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana. Ljubljana, Slovenia.

- 2016 Invited Moderator, “Discussion on Testing for Causal Mediation.” Ninth Annual meeting of the West Coast Experiments Conference, Graduate School of Business, Stanford University, Stanford, California.
- 2016 Invited Comments, “Research Ethics.” Meeting of the DIGSSCORE International Advisory Board, the Norwegian Citizen Panel Scientific Committee, and the Citizen Lab Scientific Committee. University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway.
- 2016 Invited Keynote Address, “The Exciting Opportunities Afforded by Digitalization in the Social and Behavioral Science, and the Need for Academic Research to avoid Disasters.” Kick-off Seminar for the University of Bergen’s Digital Social Science Initiative, Bergen, Norway.
- 2016 Invited Address, “Are Democratic Citizens Capable of Offering Thoughtful Prescriptions on Policy Issues? An Evaluation of the Contingent Valuation Method.” Sciences Po Methods Workshop, CEVIPOF, Centre de Recherches Politiques, Sciences Po, Paris, France.
- 2016 Invited Address, “Issue-focused Passion in American Politics.” Sciences Po Methods Workshop, CEVIPOF, Centre de Recherches Politiques, Sciences Po, Paris, France.
- 2016 Invited Address, “The Polling Blues.” Presentation sponsored by the DC Chapter of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, Washington, DC.
- 2016 Invited Presentation, “Survey Mode, Sampling Methods, and Response Rates.” Deep Water Horizon Total Value – Lessons Learned. Workshop sponsored by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Washington, DC.
- 2016 Invited Presentation, “Are American Elections Unfair? Exploring the Impact of Candidate Name Order.” Presentation at Vi at Palo Alto, Palo Alto, California.
- 2016 Invited Presentation, “The Future of Survey Research.” Lecture sponsored by the DC Chapter of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, Washington, DC.
- 2016 Invited Presentation, “The Future of Survey Research.” Lecture sponsored by the New York Chapter of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, Washington, DC.
- 2016 Invited Presentation, “The Future of Survey Research.” Lecture sponsored by the Survey Research Center, The Woodrow Wilson School, and the Center for the Study of Democratic Politics, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey.
- 2016 Invited Presentation, “The Future of Survey Research.” Lecture Sponsored by the Center for Survey Research, University of Massachusetts, Boston, Massachusetts.
- 2016 Invited Presentation, “Issue-Focused Passion in American Politics: What Happens When Citizens Become Deeply Committed to Pressuring Government on a Policy Issue.” Lecture Sponsored by the Departments of Psychology, Sociology, and Political Science, and the Center for Survey Research, University of Massachusetts, Boston, Massachusetts.
- 2016 Invited Commentary, “Science Gone Awry.” Tanner Lectures on Human Values, Sponsored by the University Center for Human Values: Trust and Distrust in Science, Princeton

University, Princeton, New Jersey.

- 2016 Invited Keynote Address, “Studying Political Attitudes as Survey Methodology Transforms.” Conference on “Inequality and Fairness of Political Reforms.” Hosted by the SFB 884 “Political Economy of Reforms” Project, University of Mannheim, Mannheim, Germany.
- 2017 Invited Presentation, “The Psychology of American Elections: Getting Into the Heads of Voters”. Presentation sponsored by the Stanford Alumni Association. Stanford in New York Facility, New York, New York.
- 2017 Invited Presentation, “The Challenges of Accurate Survey Measurement: The Case of Household Rostering.” Center for Survey Methodology, U.S. Census Bureau, Suitland, Maryland.
- 2017 Invited Address, “The Accuracy of Online Surveys with Non-probability Samples of People Who Volunteer to Do Surveys for Money.” Conference Entitled “Towards the Future: Forecasting in Social Studies” VII Sociology Grushin Conference, Sponsored by the Russia Public Opinion Research Center, Moscow, Russia.
- 2017 Invited Lecture, “Are Elections in America Unfair? Exploring the Impact of Candidate Name Order.” Lecture co-sponsored by the GESIS Leibniz Institute for Social Sciences and the Mannheim Center for European Social Research (MZES), University of Mannheim, Mannheim, Germany.
- 2017 Invited Presentation, “Attitude Measurement and Methodology”. Attitudes Conference, Annenberg Public Policy Center of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- 2017 Invited Presentation, “Campaign Ads that are Good for America.” Conference on Electoral Reform, Harris School for Public Policy, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.
- 2017 Invited Presentation, “Eliminating Unfairness: The Impact of Candidate Name Order.” Conference on Electoral Reform, Harris School for Public Policy, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.
- 2017 Invited Lecture, “How the Media Influence American Public Opinion.” Presentation at @America, sponsored by the U.S. Department of State, Jakarta, Indonesia.
- 2017 Invited presentation, “Challenges Impeding Comparability of Measurement Across Countries: Findings from an International Project Documenting Response Effects.” Conference on Advances in Scale Development in the Social Sciences: Issues of Comparability, University of Mannheim, sponsored by GESIS, Mannheim, Germany.
- 2017 Invited presentation, “Challenges Impeding Comparability of Measurement Across Countries: Findings from an International Project Documenting Response Effects.” Conference on Elections, parties, and Public Opinion in a Volatile World: A Comparative Perspective. University of Mannheim, sponsored by GESIS, the Mannheimer Zentrum fur Europäische Sozialforschung, and the University of Michigan’s Institute for Social Research, Mannheim, Germany.
- 2017 Invited panel member, “Keynote: The Politics of Climate Change.” Sixth Annual LCFS &

OPIS Carbon Markets Workshop, San Francisco, California.

- 2017 Invited lecture, “The Elections in America: Surprising Twists and Turns.” Stanford Center at Peking University Special Lecture, Beijing, China.
- 2017 Invited lecture, “Are Elections in America Unfair? Exploring the Impact of Candidate Name Order.” Methoden-Zentrum Sozialwissenschaften, Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, Göttingen, Germany.
- 2018 Inaugural Lecturer, Natalie Kahn Lecture Series, Department of Communication, University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California.
- 2018 Invited Lecture, “Social and Psychology Experiments Under the Microscope: Do Our Classic Experiments Replicate When Participant Are Representative of the General Public Rather Than Convenience Samples of College Students?” Centre for Experimental Social Sciences Seminar, Nuffield College, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom.
- 2018 Invited Lecture, “Passion in American Politics: What Happens When Citizens Become Deeply Committed to Pressuring Government on a Policy Issue”. Department of Psychology, University of Bath, Bath, United Kingdom.
- 2018 Invited Keynote Address, “An Update on the Accuracy of Probability Sample Surveys and Non-probability Sample Surveys.” Workshop on Probability-Based and Nonprobability Survey Research, Program on Political Economy of Reforms – SFB 884, University of Mannheim, Mannheim, Germany.
- 2018 Presentation, “Project Overview.” CPS Forum on Measuring Voter Turnout, Summer at Census, U.S. Census Bureau, Suitland, Maryland.
- 2018 Presentation, “Mode and Proxy Effects.” CPS Forum on Measuring Voter Turnout, Summer at Census, U.S. Census Bureau, Suitland, Maryland.
- 2018 Presentation, “Knowing More Than We Can Know.” CPS Forum on Measuring Voter Turnout, Summer at Census, U.S. Census Bureau, Suitland, Maryland.
- 2018 Invited Colloquium, “The Future of Survey Research: Meltdown or Opportunity?” Roper Center Speaker Series, Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.
- 2018 Invited Colloquium, “The Future of Survey Research: Meltdown or Opportunity?” GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences, Mannheim, Germany.

Editorial Board Member

- 1989-2000 Journal of Personality and Social Psychology
2006-2008
- 1990-1994 Journal of Experimental Social Psychology
- 1997-2003 Basic and Applied Social Psychology

1988-1991, 1994-2002	Public Opinion Quarterly
1998-2006	Media Psychology
2006-2008	Sociological Methodology
2008-	Pathways
2012-2017	Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology
2018-2020	Measurement Instruments for the Social Sciences

Internal Grants

1986	Ohio State University Office of Research and Graduate Studies Faculty Seed Grant, to support research on attitude importance.
1986	Ohio State University College of Social and Behavioral Sciences Research Expense Grant, to support research on social information processing and judgments about the self.
1987	Mershon Center Research Grant, to study the determinants of attitude importance.
1987	Ohio State University Office of Research and Graduate Studies Research Grant, to study the role of attitude importance in regulating political judgment.
1988	Ohio State University Office of Research and Graduate Studies, to support a study of the Arab/Israeli relations issue public in the United States (with Shibley Telhami).
1988	The Mershon Center, Ohio State University, to support a study of the Arab/Israeli relations issue public in the United States (with Shibley Telhami).
1988	Department of Political Science, Ohio State University, to support a study of the Arab/Israeli relations issue public in the United States (with Shibley Telhami).
1988	College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Ohio State University, to support a study of the Arab/Israeli relations issue public in the United States (with Shibley Telhami).
1991	Ohio State University Office of Research and Graduate Studies Research Grant, to study the role of satisficing in shaping responses to survey questionnaire measures of attitudes.
1993	Ohio State University Office of the Vice President for Research, to support preparation of a book on questionnaire design.
1995	College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Ohio State University, to support a study of the contingent valuation method of survey research.
1995	College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Ohio State University, to support a survey of public attitudes toward global warming.
1995	College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Ohio State University, to support research on questionnaire design.

1999	Mershon Center, Ohio State University. Foreign policy and election outcomes: A proposal to study the 2000 American Presidential election.
2003	VPUE Faculty Grant for Undergraduate Research, Stanford University.
2004	VPUE Faculty Grant for Undergraduate Research, Stanford University.
2005	VPUE Faculty Grant for Undergraduate Research, Stanford University.
2006	VPUE Faculty Grant for Undergraduate Research, Stanford University.
2009	VPUE Faculty Grant for Undergraduate Research, Stanford University.
2007	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Political Science Department, Stanford University.
2008	VPUE Faculty Grant for Undergraduate Research, Stanford University.
2008	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Political Science Department, Stanford University.
2009	VPUE Faculty Grant for Undergraduate Research, Stanford University.
2009	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Political Science Department, Stanford University.
2009	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Public Policy Program, Stanford University.
2010	VPUE Faculty Grant for Undergraduate Research, Stanford University.
2010	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Political Science Department, Stanford University.
2010	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Public Policy Program, Stanford University.
2011	VPUE Faculty Grant for Undergraduate Research, Stanford University.
2011	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Political Science Department, Stanford University.
2011	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Woods Institute for the Environment, Stanford University.
2011	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Public Policy Program, Stanford University.
2012	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Political Science Department, Stanford University.
2012	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Woods Institute for the Environment, Stanford University.

2012	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Public Policy Program, Stanford University.
2012	VPUE Faculty Grant for Undergraduate Research, Stanford University.
2013	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Political Science Department, Stanford University.
2013	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Woods Institute for the Environment, Stanford University.
2013	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Public Policy Program, Stanford University.
2014	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Political Science Department, Stanford University.
2014	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Woods Institute for the Environment, Stanford University.
2014	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Public Policy Program, Stanford University.
2014	Research Grant, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences.
2015	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Political Science Department, Stanford University.
2015	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Woods Institute for the Environment, Stanford University.
2015	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Public Policy Program, Stanford University.
2015	Research Grant, Spectrum-Stanford Health Care Innovation Challenge Program, Stanford University. (with Julie Parsonnet)
2016	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Political Science Department, Stanford University.
2017	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Public Policy Program, Stanford University.
2017	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Political Science Department, Stanford University.
2017	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Psychology Department, Stanford University.
2017	Summer Research Program on Energy Research, Precourt Institute for Energy, Stanford University.

2018	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Public Policy Program, Stanford University.
2018	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Political Science Department, Stanford University.
2018	Summer Research College Support for Undergraduates, Psychology Department, Stanford University.
2018	Summer Research Program on Energy Research, Precourt Institute for Energy, Stanford University.

External Grants and Contracts

1977	CBS Research Grant, to support development and evaluation of a mass media promotional campaign for sound recordings.
1984	Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues Doctoral Dissertation Grant-in-aid.
1984	CBS Research Grant, to support literature review/research on the causes of heavy television viewing among children and adolescents.
1985	CBS Research Grant, to support empirical research on the effect of television viewing on alcohol use among children and adolescents.
1985	CBS Research Grant, to support empirical research on the causes of heavy television viewing among children and adolescents.
1987-1989	National Institute on Aging Research Grant, to study changes in political orientations over the life span (with Duane F. Alwin).
1987	National Association of Broadcasters Research Grant, to study the causes of heavy television viewing among children and adolescents.
1988	Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues Grant-in-Aid, to support research on the causes of heavy television viewing among children and adolescents.
1990-1992	National Science Foundation, The information processing consequences of attitude importance.
1991	National Science Foundation Research Experience for Undergraduates Grant Supplement, The information processing consequences of attitude importance.
1992	Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues Grant-in-Aid, to support research on the impact of the Gulf War on the constituents of presidential evaluations.
1992	National Science Foundation Research Experience for Undergraduates Grant Supplement, The information processing consequences of attitude importance.
1994	National Science Foundation, Explaining the surprising accuracy of mail surveys.
1995	National Science Foundation Research Experience for Undergraduates Grant Supplement, Explaining the surprising accuracy of mail surveys.

1995	U.S. Department of the Interior/Minerals Management Service/University of California Coastal Marine Institute, Testing and calibrating the measurement of nonmarket values for oil spills via the contingent valuation method (with Michael Hanemann).
1995	Electric Power Research Institute/Industrial Economics, Elicitation of public perceptions regarding the potential ecological effects of climate change (part I).
1996	Electric Power Research Institute/Industrial Economics, Elicitation of public perceptions regarding the potential ecological effects of climate change (part II).
1997	National Science Foundation, Formation and change of public beliefs about global warming.
1997	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration/U.S. Environmental Protection Agency/Resources for the Future, Formation and change of public beliefs about global warming: Wave II of survey interviewing.
1998, 1999, 2000, 2001	Robert Dodd and Associates/The Battelle Memorial Institute/National Aeronautics and Space Administration, National aviation operational monitoring system questionnaire development.
2000, 2001	Resources for the Future, American public opinion on the environment.
2001, 2002	Columbus Airport Authority, The dynamics and causes of airport customer satisfaction.
2002	Time-sharing Experiments for the Social Sciences (TESS) grant (funded by the National Science Foundation), Social desirability and reports of voter turnout (with Allyson L. Holbrook).
2003	National Science Foundation, Social and psychological mechanisms of the relation between age and openness to attitude change (with Penny Visser).
2003	New York Academy of Medicine/W. K. Kellogg Foundation, Engaging the community in terrorism preparedness planning.
2003	Decade of Behavior 2000-2010 Distinguished Lecture Program Grant to feature Richard E. Petty at the 2003 annual meeting of the American Association for Public Opinion Research.
2004	National Science Foundation, Optimizing the number of points on rating scales.
2004	The Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S Department of Labor, Refining the categorization of jobs in the biotechnology industry.
2005	National Science Foundation, 2005 Summer Institute in Political Psychology.
2005	National Science Foundation, Survey Research Methodology Optimization for the Science Resource Statistics Program.
2005	National Science Foundation, American National Election Studies 2005-2010 (with Arthur Lupia).
2006	American Psychological Association, The psychology of voting and election campaigns: A proposal for a stand-alone conference (with Wendy Wood, Arthur Lupia, and John Aldrich).

- 2006 National Science Foundation, Agenda-setting workshop in the area of e-science: Development of the next generation of cybertools applied to data collections in the social and behavioral sciences (with Arthur Lupia).
- 2006 National Science Foundation, Development of a computer network for experimental and non-experimental data collection via the Internet from a nationally representative sample of American households.
- 2006 National Science Foundation and the Department of Homeland Security, Expansion of the American National Election Study: Gauging the public's Attitudes on terrorism and homeland security (with Arthur Lupia).
- 2007 National Science Foundation, 2007 Summer Institute in Political Psychology.
- 2007 National Science Foundation, Survey Research Methodology Optimization for the Science Resource Statistics Program.
- 2007 National Science Foundation, Survey Research Methodology Optimization for the Science Resource Statistics Program (Supplement).
- 2007 National Science Foundation, Research Experience for Undergraduates Supplement for the American National Election Study. (with Arthur Lupia)
- 2007 National Science Foundation, The Impact of Polls on Political Behavior.
- 2007 National Science Foundation, American National Election Studies Supplement to Support Additional Pretesting of Questionnaire Items. (with Arthur Lupia)
- 2007 National Science Foundation, American National Election Studies Supplement to Support a Conference on Methodology for Coding Open-ended Question Responses. (with Arthur Lupia)
- 2008 National Science Foundation, SGER: DHS and NSF Collaboration: Developing Polls to Test Theories of Radicalization and Potential for Radicalization. (with Arthur Lupia)
- 2008 National Science Foundation, American National Election Studies Supplement to Create a Supplemental Panel to Study the 2008 American Presidential Election. (with Arthur Lupia)
- 2016 National Science Foundation, 2008 Summer Institute in Political Psychology.
- 2017 Time-sharing Experiments for the Social Sciences (TESS) grant (funded by the National Science Foundation), Does Mentioning 'Some People' and 'Other People' in an Attitude Question Improve Measurement Quality? (with David Yeager).
- 2009 National Science Foundation, 2009 Summer Institute in Political Psychology.
- 2009 Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, Surveying Public Opinion on Healthcare.
- 2009 Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Research and Polling Studies on Key Education Topics.
- 2009 National Science Foundation, 2010-2012 Summer Institute in Political Psychology.
- 2010 National Science Foundation, American National Election Studies Supplement to Develop and Test New Methods for Coding Open-ended Survey Data. (with Arthur Lupia)

- 2018 National Science Foundation, Discovering the Mechanisms of Belief and Attitude Change on Controversial Issues: The Case of Global Warming and Trust in Scientists.
- 2019 Marketing Science Institute, Establishing the Accuracy of Online Panels Research (with Lisa Brüggén, Rebecca Weiss, David Yeager, Rui Wang, and Yph Lelkes).
- 2020 National Science Foundation, Conferences on the Future of Survey Research.
- 2021 National Science Foundation, Supplement to Grant on the Future of Survey Research.
- 2014 National Science Foundation, American National Election Studies Supplement to Develop and Test New Methods for Coding Open-ended Survey Data. (with Arthur Lupia)
- 2014 Fetzer Franklin Fund, Exploring the Replicability of Psychological Findings.
- 2022 Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford University, CASBS Best Practices in Science Group: Empirical Studies, Article Writing, and Grant Proposal Preparation. (with Lee Jussim)
- 2023 The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, Maximizing Scientific Integrity. (with Lee Jussim)
- 2015 Marketing Science Institute, Beyond the Promotion of Net Promoter Score: A Research Deep Dive on “The One Number You Need to Grow.” (with Ellen Konar)
- 2015 Fetzer Franklin Fund, Maximizing Scientific Integrity: A Conference Proposal. (with Lee Jussim)
- 2017 National Science Foundation, Implicit Bias Conference
- 2018 National Science Foundation, Consumer Innovation Survey Development.

Research Partnerships with News Media Organizations

The New York Times
 ABC News
 The Associated Press
 Time Magazine
 The Washington Post
 USA Today
 New Scientist Magazine

Books

- Weisberg, H., Krosnick, J. A., & Bowen, B. (1989). Introduction to survey research and data analysis. Chicago: Scott, Foresman.
- Krosnick, J. A. (Ed.). (1990). Thinking about politics: Comparisons of experts and novices. New York: Guilford Press (Book version of a special issue of Social Cognition, Volume 8, Number 1, 1990).

- Petty, R. E., & Krosnick, J. A. (Eds.). (1995). Attitude strength: Antecedents and consequences. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Weisberg, H., Krosnick, J. A., & Bowen, B. (1996). Introduction to survey research, polling, and data analysis. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Carson, R. T., Conaway, M. B., Hanemann, W. M., Krosnick, J. A., Mitchell, R. C., Presser, S. (2004). Valuing oil spill prevention: A case study of California's central coast. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Callegaro, M., Baker, R., Bethlehem, J., Göritz, A., Krosnick, J. A., & Lavrakas, P. J. (Eds.). (2014). Online panel research: A data quality perspective. West Sussex, UK: John Wiley and Sons.
- Review: Cornesse, C., & Blom, A. G. (2015). Review of Online Panel Research: A Data Quality Perspective. Journal of Official Statistics, 31, 809-812.
- Krosnick, J. A., Chiang, I.-C., & Stark, T. (Eds.) (2017). Political psychology: New explorations. Psychology Press. New York, New York.
- Vannette, D. L., & Krosnick, J. A. (Eds.) (2018). The Palgrave handbook of survey research. London, UK: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Fabrigar, L. R. (forthcoming). The handbook of questionnaire design. New York: Oxford University Press.

Journal Articles and Book Chapters

- Krosnick, J. A. (1978). One approach to the analysis of drumset playing. Percussive Notes, Spring-Summer, 143-149.
- Judd, C. M., Krosnick, J. A., & Milburn, M. A. (1981). Political involvement and attitude structure in the general public. American Sociological Review, 46, 660-669.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Judd, C. M. (1982). Transitions in social influence at adolescence: Who induces cigarette smoking? Developmental Psychology, 18, 359-368.
- Judd, C. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (1982). Attitude centrality, organization, and measurement. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42, 436-447.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1982). Teaching percussion: Growing with your students. National Association of College Wind and Percussion Instructors Journal, Summer, 4-7.
- Judd, C. M., Kenny, D. A., & Krosnick, J. A. (1983). Judging the positions of political candidates: Models of assimilation and contrast. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44, 952-963.
- McAlister, A. L., Krosnick, J. A., & Milburn, M. A. (1984). Causes of adolescent cigarette smoking: Tests of a structural equation model. Social Psychology Quarterly, 47, 24-36.
- Iyengar, S., Kinder, D. R., Peters, M. D., & Krosnick, J. A. (1984). The evening news and presidential evaluations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46, 778-787.
- Reprinted in Peplau, L. A., Sears, D. O., Taylor, S. E., & Freedman, J. L. (Eds.) (1988), Readings in social psychology: Classic and contemporary contributions. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Alwin, D. F., & Krosnick, J. A. (1985). The measurement of values in surveys: A comparison of ratings and rankings. Public Opinion Quarterly, 49, 535-552.
- Reprinted in Singer, E., & Presser, S. (Eds.) (1989). Survey research methods: A reader. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Reprinted in Bartholomew, D. (Ed.) (2006). Measurement. Oxford, UK: The Bardwell Press.
- Schuman, H., Ludwig, J., & Krosnick, J. A. (1986). The perceived threat of nuclear war, salience, and open questions. Public Opinion Quarterly, 50, 519-536.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Alwin, D. F. (1987). An evaluation of a cognitive theory of response order effects in survey measurement. Public Opinion Quarterly, 51, 201-219.
- Reprinted in Roberts, C., & Jowell, R. (Eds.) (2008). Attitude measurement. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1988). Attitude importance and attitude change. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 24, 240-255.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Schuman, H. (1988). Attitude intensity, importance, and certainty and susceptibility to response effects. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54, 940-952.
- Reprinted in Roberts, C., & Jowell, R. (Eds.) (2008). Attitude measurement. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1988). The role of attitude importance in social evaluation: A study of policy preferences, presidential candidate evaluations, and voting behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55, 196-210.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Alwin, D. F. (1988). A test of the form-resistant correlation hypothesis: Ratings, rankings, and the measurement of values. Public Opinion Quarterly, 52, 526-538.
- Judd, C. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (1989). The structural bases of consistency among political attitudes: The effects of political expertise and attitude importance. In A. R. Pratkanis, S. J. Breckler, & A. G. Greenwald (Eds.), Attitude Structure and Function. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1989). Attitude importance and attitude accessibility. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 15, 297-308.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1989). Question wording and reports of survey results: The case of Louis Harris and Aetna Life and Casualty. Public Opinion Quarterly, 53, 107-113.
- Reprinted in Bulmer, M. (Ed.) (2004), Questionnaires. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Alwin, D. F. (1989). Aging and susceptibility to attitude change. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57, 416-425.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1990). Government policy and citizen passion: A study of issue publics in contemporary America. Political Behavior, 12, 59-92.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1990). Expertise in political psychology. Social Cognition, 8, 1-8. (also in J. Krosnick (Ed.), Thinking about politics: Comparisons of experts and novices. New York: Guilford, 1990, pp. 1-8).

- Krosnick, J. A. (1990). Lessons learned: A review and integration of our findings. Social Cognition, 8, 154-158. (also in J. Krosnick (Ed.), Thinking about politics: Comparisons of experts and novices. New York: Guilford, 1990, pp. 154-158).
- Krosnick, J. A., Li, F., & Lehman, D. (1990). Conversational conventions, order of information acquisition, and the effect of base rates and individuating information on social judgments. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59, 1140-1152.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Milburn, M. A. (1990). Psychological determinants of political opinionation. Social Cognition, 8, 49-72. (also in J. Krosnick (Ed.), Thinking about politics: Comparisons of experts and novices. New York: Guilford, 1990, pp. 49-72).
- Krosnick, J. A., & Sedikides, C. (1990). Self-monitoring and self-protective biases in the use of consensus information to predict one's own behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58, 718-728.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Kinder, D. R. (1990). Altering the foundations of support for the president through priming. American Political Science Review, 84, 497-512.
- Reprinted in J. T. Jost and J. Sidanius (Eds.) (2004). Political psychology: Key readings. New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Reprinted in K. Arzheimer & J. Evans (Eds.) (2008). Electoral behaviour. London: Sage Publications.
- Reprinted in T. Høgenhagen and S. Winther Nielsen (Eds.) (2009). Politisk psykologi-antologi. Århus, Denmark: Aarhus University Press.
- Alwin, D. F., & Krosnick, J. A. (1991). Aging, cohorts, and the stability of sociopolitical orientations over the life span. American Journal of Sociology, 97, 169-195.
- Alwin, D. F., & Krosnick, J. A. (1991). The reliability of survey attitude measurement: The influence of question and respondent attributes. Sociological Methods and Research, 20, 139-181.
- Judd, C. M., Drake, R. A., Downing, J. W., & Krosnick, J. A. (1991). Some dynamic properties of attitude structures: Context induced response facilitation and polarization. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60, 193-202.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1990). Americans' perceptions of presidential candidates: A test of the projection hypothesis. Journal of Social Issues, 46, 159-182.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1991). Response strategies for coping with the cognitive demands of attitude measures in surveys. Applied Cognitive Psychology, 5, 213-236.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1991). The stability of political preferences: Comparisons of symbolic and non-symbolic attitudes. American Journal of Political Science, 35, 547-576.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1992). The impact of cognitive sophistication and attitude importance on response order effects and question order effects. In N. Schwarz and S. Sudman (Eds.), Order effects in social and psychological research (pp. 203-218). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Abelson, R. P. (1992). The case for measuring attitude strength in surveys. Pp. 177-203 in J. Tanur (Ed.), Questions about questions: Inquiries into the cognitive bases of surveys. New York: Russell Sage.

- Krosnick, J. A., Betz, A. L., Jussim, L. J., & Lynn, A. R. (1992). Subliminal conditioning of attitudes. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18, 152-162.
- Lehman, D. R., Krosnick, J. A., West, R. L., & Li, F. (1992). The focus of judgment effect: A question wording effect due to hypothesis confirmation bias. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18, 690-699.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Berent, M. K. (1993). Comparisons of party identification and policy preferences: The impact of survey question format. American Journal of Political Science, 37, 941-964.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Brannon, L. A. (1993). The impact of the Gulf War on the ingredients of presidential evaluations: Multidimensional effects of political involvement. American Political Science Review, 87, 963-975.
- Reprinted in H. T. Reis (Ed.). (2014). Methodological Innovations in Social Psychology. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Brannon, L. A. (1993). The media and the foundations of Presidential support: George Bush and the Persian Gulf conflict. Journal of Social Issues, 49, 167-182.
- Krosnick, J. A., Boninger, D. S., Chuang, Y. C., Berent, M. K., & Carnot, C. G. (1993). Attitude strength: One construct or many related constructs? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65, 1132-1149.
- Reprinted in S. T. Fiske (Ed.) (2013). Social Cognition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Krosnick, J. A., Berent, M. K., & Boninger, D. S. (1994). Pockets of responsibility in the American electorate: Findings of a research program on attitude importance. Political Communication, 11, 391-411.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Smith, W. A. (1994). Attitude strength. In V. S. Ramachandran (Ed.), Encyclopedia of human behavior. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Ostrom, T. M., Bond, C., Krosnick, J. A., & Sedikides, C. (1994). Attitude scales: How we measure the unmeasurable. In S. Shavitt & T. C. Brock (Eds.), Persuasion: Psychological insights and perspectives. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Rahn, W. M., Krosnick, J. A., & Breuning, M. (1994). Rationalization and derivation processes in survey studies of political candidate evaluation. American Journal of Political Science, 38, 582-600.
- Berent, M. K., & Krosnick, J. A. (1995). The relation between political attitude importance and knowledge structure. In M. Lodge & K. McGraw (Eds.), Political judgment: Structure and process. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Boninger, D. S., Krosnick, J. A., & Berent, M. K. (1995). The origins of attitude importance: Self-interest, social identification, and value-relevance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68, 61-80.
- Boninger, D. S., Krosnick, J. A., Berent, M. K., & Fabrigar, L. R. (1995). The causes and consequences of attitude importance. In R. E. Petty and J. A. Krosnick (Eds.), Attitude strength: Antecedents and consequences. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Fabrigar, L. R., & Krosnick, J. A. (1995). Attitude importance and the false consensus effect. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21, 468-479.

- Fabrigar, L. R., & Krosnick, J. A. (1995). Attitude measurement and questionnaire design. In A. S. R. Manstead & M. Hewstone (Eds.), Blackwell encyclopedia of social psychology. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Fabrigar, L. R., & Krosnick, J. A. (1995). Voting behavior. In A. S. R. Manstead & M. Hewstone (Eds.), Blackwell encyclopedia of social psychology. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Petty, R. E. (1995). Attitude strength: An overview. In R. E. Petty and J. A. Krosnick (Eds.), Attitude strength: Antecedents and consequences. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Telhami, S. (1995). Public attitudes toward Israel: A study of the attentive and issue publics. International Studies Quarterly, 39, 535-554.
- Reprinted in Israel Affairs, vol. 2 (1995/1996).
- Reprinted in G. Sheffer (Ed.) (1997). U.S.-Israeli relations at the crossroads (Israeli history, politics, and society). London: Frank Cass & Co., Ltd.
- Wegener, D. T., Downing, J., Krosnick, J. A., & Petty, R. E. (1995). Measures and manipulations of strength-related properties of attitudes: Current practice and future directions. In R. E. Petty and J. A. Krosnick (Eds.), Attitude strength: Antecedents and consequences. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Weisberg, H. F., Haynes, A. A., & Krosnick, J. A. (1995). Social group polarization in 1992. In H. F. Weisberg (Ed.), Democracy's feast: Elections in America. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House.
- Krosnick, J. A., Narayan, S. S., & Smith, W. R. (1996). Satisficing in surveys: Initial evidence. In M. T. Braverman & J. K. Slater (Eds.), Advances in survey research (pp. 29-44). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Miller, J. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (1996). News media impact on the ingredients of presidential evaluations: A program of research on the priming hypothesis. In D. Mutz & P. Sniderman (Eds.), Political persuasion and attitude change. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Narayan, S., & Krosnick, J. A. (1996). Education moderates some response effects in attitude measurement. Public Opinion Quarterly, 60, 58-88.
- Reprinted in S. Gorard (Ed.) (2008). Quantitative research in education. London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Visser, P. S., Krosnick, J. A., Marquette, J., & Curtin, M. (1996). Mail surveys for election forecasting? An evaluation of the Columbus Dispatch poll. Public Opinion Quarterly, 60, 181-227.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Fabrigar, L. R. (1997). Designing rating scales for effective measurement in surveys. In L. Lyberg, P. Biemer, M. Collins, L. Decker, E. DeLeeuw, C. Dippo, N. Schwarz, and D. Trewin (Eds.), Survey Measurement and Process Quality. New York: Wiley-Interscience.
- Miller, J. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (1997). The anatomy of news media priming. In S. Iyengar and R. Reeves (Eds.), Do the media govern? Politicians, voters, and reporters in America. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Carson, R. T., Hanemann, W. M., Kopp, R. J., Krosnick, J. A., Mitchell, R. C., Presser, S., Ruud, P. A., & Smith, V. K., with Conaway, M., & Martin, K. (1997). Temporal reliability of estimates from contingent valuation. Land Economics, 73, 151-163.

- Carson, R. T., Hanemann, W. M., Kopp, R. J., Krosnick, J. A., Mitchell, R. C., Presser, S., Ruud, P. A., & Smith, V. K., with Conaway, M., & Martin, K. (1998). Referendum design and contingent valuation: The NOAA panel's no-vote recommendation. Review of Economics and Statistics, 80, 335-338.
- Miller, J. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (1998). The impact of candidate name order on election outcomes. Public Opinion Quarterly, 62, 291-330.
- Visser, P. S., & Krosnick, J. A. (1998). The development of attitude strength over the life cycle: Surge and decline. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75, 1388-1409.
- Reprinted in G. Haddock and G. R. Maio (Eds.) (2012), *The psychology of attitudes: Key readings*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1999). Maximizing questionnaire quality. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), Measures of political attitudes. New York: Academic Press.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1999). Survey research. Annual Review of Psychology, 50, 537-567.
- Bassili, J. N., & Krosnick, J. A. (2000). Do strength-related attitude properties determine susceptibility to response effects? New evidence from response latency, attitude extremity, and aggregate indices. Political Psychology, 21, 107-132.
- Holbrook, A. L., Krosnick, J. A., Carson, R. T., & Mitchell, R. C. (2000). Violating conversational conventions disrupts cognitive processing of attitude questions. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 36, 465-494.
- Holbrook, A. L., Bizer, G. Y., & Krosnick, J. A. (2000). Political behavior of the individual. In A. E. Kazdin (Ed.), Encyclopedia of psychology. Washington, DC, and New York, NY: American Psychological Association and Oxford University Press.
- Krosnick, J. A., Holbrook, A. L., & Visser, P. S. (2000). The impact of the Fall 1997 debate about global warming on American public opinion. Public Understanding of Science, 9, 239-260.
- Miller, J. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (2000). News media impact on the ingredients of presidential evaluations: Politically knowledgeable citizens are guided by a trusted source. American Journal of Political Science, 44, 301-315.
- Visser, P. S., Krosnick, J. A., & Lavrakas, P. (2000). Survey research. In H. T. Reis & C. M. Judd (Eds.), Handbook of research methods in social psychology. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Visser, P. S., Krosnick, J. A., Marquette, J., & Curtin, M. (2000). Improving election forecasting: Allocation of undecided respondents, identification of likely voters, and response order effects. In P. Lavrakas & M. Traugott (Eds.), Election polls, the news media, and democracy. New York, NY: Chatham House.
- Bizer, G. Y., & Krosnick, J. A. (2001). Exploring the structure of strength-related attitude features: The relation between attitude importance and attitude accessibility. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81, 566-586.
- Holbrook, A. L., Krosnick, J. A., Visser, P. S., Gardner, W. L., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2001). Attitudes toward presidential candidates and political parties: Initial optimism, inertial first impressions, and a focus on flaws. American Journal of Political Science, 45, 930-950.
- Reprinted in Lavine, H. (Ed.) (2010). Political psychology. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Krosnick, J. A. (2002). Is political psychology sufficiently psychological? Distinguishing political psychology from psychological political science. In J. Kuklinski (Ed.), Thinking about political psychology. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2002). The challenges of political psychology: Lessons to be learned from research on attitude perception. In J. Kuklinski (Ed.), Thinking about political psychology. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2002). The causes of no-opinion responses to attitude measures in surveys: They are rarely what they appear to be. In R. M. Groves, D. A. Dillman, J. L. Eltinge, & R. J. A. Little (Eds.), Survey nonresponse. New York: Wiley.
- Krosnick, J. A., Holbrook, A. L., Berent, M. K., Carson, R. T., Hanemann, W. M., Kopp, R. J., Mitchell, R. C., Presser, S., Ruud, P. A., Smith, V. K., Moody, W. R., Green, M. C., & Conaway, M. (2002). The impact of "no opinion" response options on data quality: Non-attitude reduction or an invitation to satisfice? Public Opinion Quarterly, *66*, 371-403.
- Reprinted in Roberts, C., & Jowell, R. (Eds.) (2008). Attitude measurement. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Krosnick, J. A., & McGraw K. M. (2002). Psychological political science vs. political psychology true to its name: A plea for balance. In K. R. Monroe (Ed.), Political psychology. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Swait, J., Adamowicz, W., Hanemann, M., Diederich, A., Krosnick, J. A., Layton, D., Provencher, W., Schakade, D., & Tourangeau, R. (2002). Context dependence and aggregation in disaggregate choice analysis. Marketing Letters, *13*, 195-205.
- Anand, S., & Krosnick, J. A. (2003). The impact of attitudes toward foreign policy goals on public preferences among presidential candidates: A study of issue publics and the attentive public in the 2000 U.S. Presidential election. Presidential Studies Quarterly, *33*, 31-71.
- Chang, L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2003). Measuring the frequency of regular behaviors: Comparing the 'typical week' to the 'past week.' Sociological Methodology, *33*, 55-80.
- Holbrook, A. L., Green, M. C., & Krosnick, J. A. (2003). Telephone vs. face-to-face interviewing of national probability samples with long questionnaires: Comparisons of respondent satisficing and social desirability response bias. Public Opinion Quarterly, *67*, 79-125.
- Krosnick, J. A., Anand, S. N., & Hartl, S. P. (2003). Psychosocial predictors of heavy television viewing among preadolescents and adolescents. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, *25*, 87-110.
- Visser, P. S., Krosnick, J. A., & Simmons, J. (2003). Distinguishing the cognitive and behavioral consequences of attitude importance and certainty: A new approach to testing the common-factor hypothesis. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, *39*, 118-141.
- Bizer, G. Y., Krosnick, J. A., Holbrook, A. L., Wheeler, S. C., Rucker, D. D., & Petty, R. E. (2004). The impact of personality on cognitive, behavioral, and affective political processes: The effects of need to evaluate. Journal of Personality, *72*, 995-1028.
- Bizer, G. Y., Visser, P. S., Berent, M. K., & Krosnick, J. A. (2004). Importance, knowledge, and accessibility: Exploring the dimensionality of strength-related attitude properties. In W. E. Saris & P. M. Sniderman (Eds.), Studies in public opinion: Gauging attitudes, nonattitudes, measurement error and change. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Krosnick, J. A., Miller, J. M., & Tichy, M. P. (2004). An unrecognized need for ballot reform: Effects of candidate name order. In A. N. Crigler, M. R. Just, and E. J. McCaffery (Eds.), Rethinking the vote: The politics and prospects of American election reform. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Miller, J. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (2004). Threat as a motivator of political activism: A field experiment. Political Psychology, 25, 507-523.
- Anand, S., & Krosnick, J. A. (2005). Demographic predictors of media use among infants, toddlers, and preschoolers. American Behavioral Scientist, 48, 539-561.
- Holbrook, A. L., Berent, M. K., Krosnick, J. A., Visser, P. S., & Boninger, D. S. (2005). Attitude importance and the accumulation of attitude-relevant knowledge in memory. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88, 749-769.
- Holbrook, A. L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2005). Meta-psychological vs. operative measures of ambivalence: Differentiating the consequences of perceived intra-psychic conflict and real intra-psychic conflict. In S. C. Craig & M. D. Martinez (Eds.), Ambivalence and the structure of public opinion. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Krosnick, J. A., Judd, C. M., & Wittenbrink, B. (2005). The measurement of attitudes. In D. Albarracín, B. T. Johnson, & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), Handbook of attitudes and attitude change. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Reprinted in Roberts, C., & Jowell, R. (Eds.) (2008). Attitude measurement. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Schaeffer, E. M., Krosnick, J. A., Langer, G. E., & Merkle, D. M. (2005). Comparing the quality of data obtained by minimally balanced and fully balanced attitude questions. Public Opinion Quarterly, 69, 417-428.
- Fabrigar, L. R., Krosnick, J. A., & MacDougall, B. L. (2006). Attitude measurement: Techniques for measuring the unobservable. In M. C. Green, S. Shavitt, & T. C. Brock (Eds.), Persuasion: Psychological insights and perspectives. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Krosnick, J. A., Chang, L., Sherman, S. J., Chassin, L., & Presson, C. (2006). The effects of beliefs about the health consequences of cigarette smoking on smoking onset. Journal of Communication, 56, S18-S37.
- Krosnick, J. A., Holbrook, A. L., Lowe, L. & Visser, P. S. (2006). The origins and consequences of democratic citizens' policy agendas: A study of popular concern about global warming. Climatic Change, 77, 7-43.
- Krosnick, J. A., Holbrook, A. L., & Visser, P. S. (2006). Optimizing brief assessments in research on the psychology of aging: A pragmatic approach to survey and self-report measurement. In National Research Council, *When I'm 64*. Committee on Aging Frontiers in Social Psychology, Personality, and Adult Developmental Psychology. Laura L. Carstensen and Christine R. Hartel, editors. Board on Behavioral, Cognitive, and Sensory Sciences, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Visser, P. S., Bizer, G. Y., & Krosnick, J. A. (2006). Exploring the latent structure of strength-related attitude attributes. In M. Zanna (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Cornell, D. G., Krosnick, J. A., & Chang, L. (2006). Student reactions to being wrongly informed of failing a high-stakes test: The case of the Minnesota Basic Standards Test. Educational Policy, 20, 718-751.

- Holbrook, A. L., Krosnick, J. A., Moore, D., & Tourangeau, R. (2007). Response order effects in dichotomous categorical questions presented orally: The impact of question and respondent attributes. Public Opinion Quarterly, 71, 325-348.
- Malhotra, N., & Krosnick, J. A. (2007). The effect of survey mode on inferences about political attitudes and behavior: Comparing the 2000 and 2004 ANES to internet surveys with non-probability samples. Political Analysis, 15, 286-323.
- Malhotra, N., & Krosnick, J. A. (2007). Retrospective and prospective performance assessments during the 2004 election campaign: Tests of mediation and news media priming. Political Behavior, 29, 249-278.
- Malhotra, N. & Krosnick, J. A. (2007). Procedures for updating classification systems: A study of biotechnology and the standard occupational classification system. Journal of Official Statistics, 23, 409-432.
- Schneider, D., Tahk, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2007). Reconsidering the impact of behavior prediction questions on illegal drug use: The importance of using proper analytic methods in social psychology. Social Influence, 2, 178-196.
- Holbrook, A. L., Krosnick, J. A., & Pfent, A. M. (2008). The causes and consequences of response rates in surveys by the news media and government contractor survey research firms. In J. M. Lepkowski, C. Tucker, J. M. Brick, E. D. De Leeuw, L. Japac, P. J. Lavrakas, M. W. Link, & R. L. Sangster (Eds.), Advances in telephone survey methodology. New York: Wiley.
- Iyengar, S., Hahn, K. S., Krosnick, J. A., & Walker, J. (2008). Selective exposure to campaign communication: The role of anticipated agreement and issue public membership. Journal of Politics, 70, 186-200.
- Visser, P. S., Holbrook, A. L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2008). Knowledge and attitudes. In W. Donsbach & M. W. Traugott (Eds.), Handbook of public opinion research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- Harder, J., & Krosnick, J. A. (2008). Why do people vote? A psychological analysis of the causes of voter turnout. Journal of Social Issues, 64, 525-549.
- Krosnick, J. A., Malka, A., & Yeager, D. S. (2009). State of the nation: Getting warmer. Boston Review, 34, 6.
- Krosnick, J. A., Visser, P. S., & Harder, J. (2009). The psychological underpinnings of political behavior. In S. T. Fiske, D. T. Gilbert, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), Handbook of social psychology. New York, NY: John Wiley.
- Malka, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2009). The association of knowledge with concern about global warming: Trusted information sources shape public thinking. Risk Analysis, 29, 633-647.
- Rabinowitz, J. L., Sears, D. O., Sidanius, J., & Krosnick, J. A. (2009). Why do white Americans oppose race-targeted policies? Clarifying the impact of symbolic racism. Political Psychology, 30, 805-828.
- Chang, L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2009). National surveys via RDD telephone interviewing vs. the Internet: Comparing sample representativeness and response quality. Public Opinion Quarterly, 73, 641-678.
- Eaton, A. A., Visser, P. S., Krosnick, J. A., & Anand, S. (2009). Social power and attitude strength over the life cycle. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35, 1646-1660.

- Malhotra, N., Krosnick, J. A., and Thomas, R. K. (2009). Optimal design of branching questions to measure bipolar constructs. Public Opinion Quarterly, 73, 304-324.
- Pasek, J., Tahk, A., Lelkes, Y., Krosnick, J. A., Payne, K., Akhtar, O., & Tompson, T. (2009). Determinants of turnout and candidate choice in the 2008 U.S. Presidential election: Illuminating the impact of racial prejudice and other considerations. Public Opinion Quarterly, 73, 943-994.
- Baker, R., Blumberg, S., Brick, J. M., Couper, M. P., Courtright, M., Dennis, M., Dillman, D., Frankel, M. R., Garland, P., Groves, R. M., Kennedy, C., Krosnick, J. A., Lee, D., Lavrakas, P. J., Link, M., Piekarski, L., Rao, K., Thomas, R. K., & Zahs, D. (2010). AAPOR report on online panels. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1-71.
- Chang, L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2010). Comparing oral interviewing with self-administered computerized questionnaires: An experiment. Public Opinion Quarterly, 74, 154-167.
- Holbrook, A. L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2010). Social desirability bias in voter turnout reports: Tests using the item count technique. Public Opinion Quarterly, 74, 37-67.
- Holbrook, A. L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2010). Measuring voter turnout by using the randomized response technique: Evidence calling into question the method's validity. Public Opinion Quarterly, 74, 328-343.
- Holbrook, A. L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2010). Operative and meta-psychological manifestations of attitude accessibility: Two different constructs, not two measures of the same construct. In J. P. Forgas, J. Cooper, & W. D. Crano (Eds.), The Psychology of Attitudes and Attitude Change. Florence, Kentucky: Psychology Press.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Presser, S. (2010). Questionnaire design. In J. D. Wright & P. V. Marsden (Eds.), Handbook of survey research (Second Edition). West Yorkshire, England: Emerald Group.
- Pasek, J., & Krosnick, J. A. (2010). Optimizing survey questionnaire design in political science: Insights from psychology. In J. Leighley (Ed.), Oxford handbook of American elections and political behavior. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Payne, B. K., Krosnick, J. A., Pasek, J., Lelkes, Y., Akhtar, O., & Tompson, T. (2010). Implicit and explicit prejudice in the 2008 American presidential election. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 46, 367-374.
- Saris, W., Revilla, M., Krosnick, J. A., & Shaeffer, E. (2010). Comparing questions with agree/disagree response options to questions with item-specific response options. Survey Research Methods, 4, 61-79.
- Schneider, D., DeBell, M., & Krosnick, J. A. (2010). Using the American National Election Study surveys to test social psychological hypotheses. In K. Trzesniewski, M. B. Donnellan, & R. E. Lucas (Eds.), Secondary Data Analysis: An Introduction for Psychologists. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Yeager, D. S., & Krosnick, J. A. (2010). The validity of self-reported nicotine product use in the 2001-2008 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey. Medical Care, 48, 1128-1132.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2011). Experiments for evaluating survey questions. In K. Miller, J. Madans, G. Willis, & A. Maitland (Eds.), Question evaluation methods. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Lupia, A. (2011). The American National Election Studies and the importance of new ideas. In J. A. Aldrich & K. M. McGraw (Eds.), Improving public opinion surveys: Interdisciplinary innovation and the American National Election Studies. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Krosnick, J. A., & Lupia, A. (2011). How the ANES used online commons proposals and pilot study reports to develop its 2008 questionnaires. In J. A. Aldrich & K. M. McGraw (Eds.), Improving public opinion surveys: Interdisciplinary innovation and the American National Election Studies. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Villar, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2011). Global warming vs. climate change, taxes vs. prices: Does word choice matter? Climatic Change, 105, 1-12.
- Yeager, D. S., & Krosnick, J. A. (2011). Re: Response to the validity of self-reported nicotine product use in the 2001-2008 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey. Medical Care, 49, 332.
- Yeager, D. S., & Krosnick, J. A. (2011). Does mentioning “some people” and “other people” in a survey question increase the accuracy of adolescents’ self-reports? Developmental Psychology, 47, 1674-1679.
- Yeager, D. S., Larson, S. B., Krosnick, J. A., & Tompson, T. (2011). Measuring Americans’ issue priorities: A new version of the most important problem question reveals more concern about global warming and the environment. Public Opinion Quarterly, 75, 125-138.
- Yeager, D. S., Krosnick, J. A., Chang, L., Javitz, H. S., Levendusky, M. S., Simpser, A., & Wang, R. (2011). Comparing the accuracy of RDD telephone surveys and Internet surveys conducted with probability and non-probability samples. Public Opinion Quarterly, 75, 709-747.
- Cor, K., Haertel, E., Krosnick, J. A., & Malhotra, N. (2012). Improving ability measurement in surveys by following the principles of IRT: The Wordsum vocabulary test in the General Social Survey. Social Science Research, 41, 1003-1016.
- Daniels, D. P., Krosnick, J. A., Tichy, M. P., & Tompson, T. (2012). Public opinion on environmental policy in the United States. In M. Kraft & S. Kamieniecki (Eds.), Handbook of U.S. Environmental Policy. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lelkes, Y., Krosnick, J. A., Marks, D. M., Judd, C. M., & Park, B. (2012). Complete anonymity compromises the accuracy of self-reports. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48, 1291-1299.
- Yeager, D. S., & Krosnick, J. A. (2012). Does mentioning “some people” and “other people” in an opinion question improve measurement quality? Public Opinion Quarterly, 76, 131-141.
- Holbrook, A. L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2013). A new question sequence to measure voter turnout in telephone surveys: Results of an experiment in the 2006 ANES Pilot Study. Public Opinion Quarterly, 77, 106-123.
- Krosnick, J. A., & MacInnis, B. (2013). Does the American public support legislation to reduce greenhouse gas emissions? Deadalus, 142, 26-39.
- Revilla, M. A., Saris, W. E., & Krosnick, J. A. (2014). Choosing the number of categories in agree-disagree scales. Sociological Methods and Research, 43, 73-97.
- Callegaro, M., Baker, R., Bethlehem, J., Göritz, A., Krosnick, J. A., & Lavrakas, P. J. (2014). Online panel research: History, concepts, applications, and a look at the future. In Callegaro, M., Baker, R., Bethlehem, J., Göritz, A., Krosnick, J. A., & Lavrakas, P. J. (Eds.). (2014). Online panel research: A data quality perspective. West Sussex, UK: John Wiley and Sons.
- Callegaro M., Villar, A., Krosnick, J. A., & Yeager, D. (2014). A critical review of studies investigating the quality of data obtained with online panels. In Callegaro, M., Baker, R., Bethlehem, J., Göritz, A.,

- Krosnick, J. A., & Lavrakas, P. J. (Eds.). (2014). Online panel research: A data quality perspective. West Sussex, UK: John Wiley and Sons.
- Callegaro, M., & Krosnick, J. A. (2014). Introduction to Part I. In Callegaro, M., Baker, R., Bethlehem, J., Göritz, A., Krosnick, J. A., & Lavrakas, P. J. (Eds.). (2014). Online panel research: A data quality perspective. West Sussex, UK: John Wiley and Sons.
- Chen, E., Simonovits, G., Krosnick, J. A., & Pasek, J. (2014). The impact of candidate name order on election outcomes in North Dakota. Electoral Studies, *35*, 115-122.
- Göritz, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2014). Introduction to Part IV. In Callegaro, M., Baker, R., Bethlehem, J., Göritz, A., Krosnick, J. A., & Lavrakas, P. J. (Eds.). (2014). Online panel research: A data quality perspective. West Sussex, UK: John Wiley and Sons.
- Krosnick, J. A., Malhotra, N., & Mittal, U. (2014). Public misunderstanding of political facts: How question wording affected estimates of partisan differences in birtherism. Public Opinion Quarterly, *78*, 147-165.
- Krosnick, J. A., Lavrakas, P., & Kim, N. (2014). Survey research. In H. T. Reis & C. M. Judd (Eds.), Handbook of research methods in social psychology (Second Edition). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Pasek, J., Schneider, D., Krosnick, J. A., Tahk, A., & Ophir, E. (2014). Prevalence and moderators of the candidate name-order effect: Evidence from all statewide general elections in California. Public Opinion Quarterly, *78*, 416-439.
- Pasek, J., Stark, T. H., Krosnick, J. A., Thompson, T., & Payne, B. K. (2014). Attitudes toward Blacks in the Obama era: Changing distributions and impacts on job approval and electoral choice, 2008-2012. Public Opinion Quarterly, *78*, 276-302.
- Vannette, D. L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2014). A comparison of mindless and survey satisficing. In A. Ie, C. T. Ngunoumen, & E. J. Langer (Eds.), The Wiley-Blackwell Handbook of Mindfulness. West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kim, N., Krosnick, J. A., & Casasanto, D. (2015). Moderators of candidate name order effects in elections: An experiment. Political Psychology, *36*, 525-542.
- Krosnick, J. A., & MacInnis, B. (2015). Fox and Not-Fox television news impact on opinions on global warming: Selective exposure, not motivated reasoning. In J. P. Forgas, K. Fiedler, & W. D. Crano (Eds.), Social Psychology and Politics. New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- MacInnis, B., Krosnick, J. A., Abeles, A., Caldwell, M. R., Prahl, E., & Dunne, D. D. (2015). The American public's preference for preparation for the possible effects of global warming: Impact of communication strategies. Climatic Change, *128*, 17-33.
- Pasek, J., Sood, G., & Krosnick, J. A. (2015). Misinformed about the Affordable Care Act? Leveraging certainty to assess the prevalence of misperceptions. Journal of Communication, *65*, 660-673.
- Pasek, J., Stark, T. H., Krosnick, J. A., & Thompson, T. (2015). What motivates a conspiracy theory? Birther beliefs, partisanship, liberal-conservative ideology, and anti-Black attitudes. Electoral Studies, *40*, 482-489.
- Berent, M. K., Krosnick, J. A., & Lupia, A. (2016). Measuring voter registration and turnout in surveys: Do official government records yield more accurate assessments? Public Opinion Quarterly, *80*, 597-621.

- Chapman, D. J., Bishop, R. C., Hanemann, W. M., Kanninen, B. J., Krosnick, J. A., Morey, E. R., & Tourangeau, R. (2016). On the adequacy of scope test results: Comments on Desvousges, Mathews, and Train. Ecological Economics, 130, 356-360.
- Harbridge, L., Krosnick, J. A., and Wooldridge, J. M. (2016). Presidential approval and gas prices: Sociotropic or pocketbook influence? In Krosnick, J. A., Chiang, I.-C., & Stark, T. (Eds.), Political Psychology: New Explorations. Psychology Press. New York, New York.
- Krosnick, J. A., Stark, T. H., & Chiang, I.-C. (2016). The two core goals of political psychology. In Krosnick, J. A., Chiang, I.-C., & Stark, T. (Eds.), Political Psychology: New Explorations. Psychology Press. New York, New York.
- MacInnis, B., & Krosnick, J. A. (2016). The impact of candidates' statements about global warming on electoral success in 2008 to 2015: Evidence Using Five Methodologies. In Krosnick, J. A., Chiang, I.-C., & Stark, T. (Eds.), Political Psychology: New Explorations. Psychology Press. New York, New York.
- MacInnis, B., & Krosnick, J. A. (2016). Trust in scientists' statements about the environment and American public opinion on global warming. In Krosnick, J. A., Chiang, I.-C., & Stark, T. (Eds.), Political Psychology: New Explorations. Psychology Press. New York, New York.
- Miller, J. M., Krosnick, J. A., & Fabrigar, L. R. (2016). The origins of policy issue salience: Personal and national importance impact on behavioral, cognitive, and emotional issue engagement. In Krosnick, J. A., Chiang, I.-C., & Stark, T. (Eds.), Political Psychology: New Explorations. Psychology Press. New York, New York.
- Miller, J. M., Krosnick, J. A., Holbrook, A., Tahk, A., & Dionne, L. (2016). The impact of policy change threat on financial contributions to interest groups. In Krosnick, J. A., Chiang, I.-C., & Stark, T. (Eds.), Political Psychology: New Explorations. Psychology Press. New York, New York.
- Thomas, R. K., Krosnick, J. A., Shook, N. J., & Chiang, I.-C. (2016). "Forever changed?" Some surprising findings about U.S. Public Opinion after the attacks of 9/11/2001 on the U.S. In Krosnick, J. A., Chiang, I.-C., & Stark, T. (Eds.), Political Psychology: New Explorations. Psychology Press. New York, New York.
- Visser, P. S., Krosnick, J. A., & Norris, C. J. (2016). Attitude importance and attitude-relevant knowledge: Motivator and enabler. In Krosnick, J. A., Chiang, I.-C., & Stark, T. (Eds.), Political Psychology: New Explorations. Psychology Press. New York, New York.
- Bishop, R.C., Boyle, K. J., Carson, R. T., Chapman, D., Hanemann, W. M., Kanninen, B., Kopp, R. J., Krosnick, J. A., List, J., Meade, N., Paterson, R., Presser, S., Smith, V. K., Tourangeau, R., Welsh, M., Wooldridge, J.M., DeBell, M., Donovan, C., Konopka, M., & Scherer, N. (2017). Putting a value on injuries to natural assets: The BP oil spill. Science, 356, 253-254.
- Howe, L. C., & Krosnick, J. A. (2017). Attitude strength. Annual Review of Psychology, 68, 327-351.
- Krosnick, J. A., Malhotra, N., Mo, C. H., Bruera, E. F., Chang, L., Pasek, J., & Thomas, R. K. (2017). Perceptions of health risks of cigarette smoking: A new measure reveals widespread misunderstanding. PLoS ONE, 12(8): e0182063 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0182063>.
- Lundberg, K. B., Payne, B. K., Pasek, J., & Krosnick, J. A. (2017). Racial attitudes predicted changes in ostensibly race-neutral political attitudes under the Obama administration. Political Psychology, 38, 313-330.

- Stark, T. H., & Krosnick, J. A. (2017). GENSI: A new graphical tool to collect ego-centered network data. Social Networks, 48, 36-45.
- MacInnis, B., Krosnick, J. A., Ho, A. S., & Cho, M-J. (2018). The accuracy of measurements with probability survey samples: Replication and extension. Public Opinion Quarterly, 82, 707-744.
- DeBell, M., Krosnick, J. A., Gera, K., Yeager, D., & MacDonald, M. (in press). The turnout gap in surveys: Explanations and solutions. Sociological Methods and Research.
- Kim, N., Krosnick, J. A., & Lelkes, Y. (in press). Race of interviewer effects in telephone surveys preceding the 2008 U.S. Presidential elections. International Journal of Public Opinion Research.
- Silber, H., Stark, T. H., Krosnick, J. A., & Blom, A. G. (in press). Multi-national study of questionnaire design. In Johnson, T., Dorer, B. Stoop, I., & Pennell, B-E. (Eds.), Advances in Comparative Survey Methods: Multicultural, Multinational and Multiregional (3MC) Contexts. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Stark, T. H., Silber, H., Krosnick, J. A., Blom, A. G., Aoyagi, M., Belchior, A., Bosnjak, M., Clement, S. L., John, M., Jónsdóttir, G. A., Lawson, K., Lynn, P., Martinsson, Shamshiri-Petersen, D., Tvinnereim, E., Yu, R. (in press). Generalization of classic question order effects across cultures. Sociological Methods and Research.

Other Reports and Publications

- Telhami, S., & Krosnick, J. A. (1989). American sentiment on Israeli-Palestinian fight: No favorites; Just make peace. Op-ed article in The Los Angeles Times, March 14, 1989. (Reprinted in the Columbus Dispatch, March 17, 1989)
- Krosnick, J. A. (1990). The uses and abuses of public opinion polls: The case of Louis Harris and Associates. Chronicles, 14, 47-49.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1990). The impact of satisficing on survey data quality. In Proceedings of the Bureau of the Census 1990 Annual Research Conference (pp. 835-845). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Smith, W. R., Culpepper, I. J., & Krosnick, J. A. (1992). The impact of question order on cognitive effort in survey responding. In Proceedings of the Sixth National Conference on Undergraduate Research. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Hermann, M. G. (1993). Report on the 1991 Ohio State University Summer Institute in Political Psychology. Political Psychology, 14, 363-373.
- Carson, R. T., Hanemann, W. M., Kopp, R. J., Krosnick, J. A., Mitchell, R. C., Presser, S., Ruud, P. A., & Smith, V. K. (1994). Prospective interim lost use value due to DDT and PCB contamination in the Southern California Bight. La Jolla, CA: Natural Resource Damage Assessment.
- Carson, R. T., Conaway, M. B., Hanemann, W. M., Krosnick, J. A., Martin, K. M., McCubbin, D. R., Mitchell, R. C., Presser, S. (1995). The value of preventing oil spill injuries to natural resources along California's central coast. La Jolla, CA: Natural Resource Damage Assessment.
- Krosnick, J. A., Visser, P. S., & Holbrook, A. L. (1998). American opinion on global warming: The impact of the Fall 1997 debate. Resources, 133, 5-9.

- Krosnick, J. A. (2000). The threat of satisficing in surveys: The shortcuts respondents take in answering questions. Survey Methods Newsletter, 20, 4-8.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2000). Americans are ready for the debacle to end. Newsday, December 7, A63-A66.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2001). The psychology of voting. The Psychology Place.
<http://www.psychplace.com/editorials/krosnick/krosnick1.html>.
- Green, M. C., & Krosnick, J. A. (2001). Comparing telephone and face-to-face interviewing in terms of data quality: The 1982 National Election Studies Method Comparison Project. In D. O'Rourke (Ed.), Health survey research methods. Hyattsville, Maryland: Department of Health and Human Services. DHHS Publication No. (PHS) 01-1013.
- Silver, M. D., & Krosnick, J. A. (2001). Optimizing survey measurement accuracy by matching question design to respondent memory organization. In Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology Research Conference, 2001. NTIS: PB2002-100103. <http://www.fcsm.gov/01papers/Krosnick.pdf>
- Krosnick, J. A. (2003). Introduction. In G. R. Walden, Survey research methodology, 1990-1999: An annotated bibliography. Westpoint, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2003). AAPOR in Nashville: The program for the 58th annual conference. AAPOR News, 31, 1, 3.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2003). Response rates, Huffington, and More: Reflections on the 58th annual conference. AAPOR News, 31, 1, 4-5.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2003). Proceedings of the fifty-eighth annual conference of the American Association for Public Opinion Research. Public Opinion Quarterly.
- Fiorina, M., & Krosnick, J. A. (2004). The Economist/YouGov Internet Presidential poll.
<http://www.economist.com/media/pdf/Paper.pdf>.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2006). What pilots could tell us. Op-ed essay in the New York Times, August 30, 2006.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2006). Are we really safer in the skies today? Aviation Law Prof Blog, September 5.
<http://lawprofessors.typepad.com/aviation/>
- Krosnick, J. A. (2006). In the voting booth, bias starts at the top. Op-ed in The New York Times, November 4, 2006.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2006). In the voting booth, name order can sway an election. Opinion essay in the "Perspective" section of The San Jose Mercury News, November 26, 2006.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2008). Evaluation of NORC's cognitive pretesting of new items for the General Social Survey. Report to the GSS Board of Overseers.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2008). Ballot changes cited in vote's discrepancy with polls: Clinton's favorable placement on ballots may account for part of poll mistakes. Opinion essay on ABCNews.com, January 9, 2008.
- Chapman, D. J., Bishop, R. C., Hanemann, W. M., Kanninen, B. J., Krosnick, J. A., Morey, E. R., & Tourangeau, R. 2009. Natural resource damages associated with aesthetic and ecosystem injuries to Oklahoma's Illinois River System and Tenkiller Lake. Boulder, CO: Stratus Consulting.

- Yeager, D. S., Krosnick, J. A., & Javitz, H.A. (2009). More on the problems with opt-in Internet surveys. Guest blog, “The Numbers”, <http://blogs.abcnews.com/thenumbers/2009/09/guest-blog-more-on-the-problems-with-optin-internet-surveys.html>.
- Yeager, D. S., & Krosnick, J. A. (2009). Were the benchmarks really wrong? Guest blog, “The Numbers”, <http://blogs.abcnews.com/thenumbers/2009/12/survey-accuracy-revisiting-the-benchmarks-.html>.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2010). The climate majority. Op-ed in the New York Times, June 9, 2010.
- Pasek, J., & Krosnick, J. A. (2010). Measuring intent to participate and participation in the 2010 census and their correlates and trends: Comparisons of RDD telephone and non-probability sample internet survey data. Survey Methodology Report #2010-15, Washington, DC: Statistical Research Division, U.S. Census Bureau. <http://www.census.gov/srd/papers/pdf/ssm2010-15.pdf>
- Berent, M. K., Krosnick, J. A., & Lupia, A. (2011). The quality of government records and “over-reporting” of registration and voting in surveys: Lessons from the 2008 ANES Panel Study’s registration and turnout validation exercises. Technical report, American National Election Studies. <http://electionstudies.org/resources/papers/nes012554.pdf>
- Krosnick, J. A., Kim, N., & MacInnis, B. (2014). What Americans think about climate change. Resources, 187: 40-44.
- Krosnick, J. A., Presser, S., Fealing, K. H., & Ruggles, S. with Vannette, D. L. (2015). The Future of Survey Research: Challenges and Opportunities. A report to the National Science Foundation. Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences Directorate, National Science Foundation.
- Bollen, K., Cacioppo, J. T., Kaplan, R. M., Krosnick, J. A., & Olds, J. L. (2015). Social, behavioral, and economic sciences perspectives on robust and reliable science. Report of the Subcommittee on Replicability in Science, Advisory Committee to the Directorate for Social, Behavioral, and Economics Sciences, National Science Foundation.

Book Reviews

- Krosnick, J. A. (1987). Review of **Political Cognition: The 19th Annual Carnegie Symposium on Cognition**, edited by R. R. Lau and D. O. Sears. American Political Science Review, 81, 266-268.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1988). Review of **The Choice Questionnaire**, by Peter Neijens. Public Opinion Quarterly, 52, 408-411.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1993). Review of **Measurement Errors in Surveys**, edited by P. P. Biemer, R. M. Groves, L. E. Lyberg, N. A. Mathiowetz, & S. Sudman. Public Opinion Quarterly, 57, 277-280.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1994). A new introduction to survey methods: Review of **Questionnaire Design, Interviewing and Attitude Measurement**, by A. N. Oppenheim. Contemporary Psychology, 39, 221-222.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1997). Review of **Thinking About Answers: The Application of Cognitive Processes to Survey Methodology**, by S. Sudman, N. M. Bradburn, and N. Schwarz, and **Answering Questions: Methodology for Determining Cognitive and Communicative Processes in Survey Research**, edited by N. Schwarz and S. Sudman. Public Opinion Quarterly, 61, 664-667.

Krosnick, J. A. (1998). Review of **What Americans Know about Politics and Why It Matters**, by M. X. Delli-Carpini and S. Keeter. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 559, 189-191.

Book Jacket Endorsement of Books

Callegaro, C., Manfreda, K. L., & Vehovar, V. (2015). Web Survey Methodology. London: Sage Publications.

Erikson, R. D., & Wlezien, C. (2012). The Timeline of Presidential Elections: How Campaigns Do (and Do Not) Matter. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Jussim, L. J. (2012). Social Perception and Social Reality: Why Accuracy Dominates Bias and Self-Fulfilling Prophecy. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Mutz, D. C., Brody, R. A., & Sniderman, P. M. (1996). Persuasion and Attitude Change. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Presentations

Milburn, M. A., & Krosnick, J. A. (1979). Social psychology applied to smoking and drug abuse prevention. Paper presented at the New England Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Framingham, Massachusetts.

Krosnick, J. A., McAlister, A. L., & Milburn, M. A. (1980). Research design for evaluating a peer leadership intervention to prevent adolescent substance abuse. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Montreal, Canada.

McAlister, A. L., Gordon, N. P., Krosnick, J. A., & Milburn, M. A. (1982). Experimental and correlational tests of a theoretical model for smoking prevention. Paper presented at the Society for Behavioral Medicine Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.

Kinder, D. R., Iyengar, S., Krosnick, J. A., & Peters, M. D. (1983). More than meets the eye: The impact of television news on evaluations of presidential performance. Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.

Krosnick, J. A. (1983). The relationship of attitude centrality to attitude stability. Paper presented at the American Sociological Association Annual Convention, Detroit, Michigan.

Alwin, D. F., & Krosnick, J. A. (1984). The measurement of values: A comparison of ratings and rankings. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Delavan, Wisconsin.

Schuman, H., Ludwig, J., & Krosnick, J. A. (1984). Measuring the salience and importance of public issues over time. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Delavan, Wisconsin.

Krosnick, J. A. (1984). Attitude extremity, stability, and self-report accuracy: The effects of attitude centrality. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Delavan, Wisconsin.

- Krosnick, J. A. (1984). The influence of consensus information on predictions of one's own behavior. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Toronto, Canada.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Alwin, D. F. (1986). An evaluation of a cognitive theory of response order effects in survey measurement. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, St. Petersburg, Florida.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1986). A new look at question order effects in surveys. Paper presented at the Symposium on Cognitive Sciences and Survey Research, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1987). The role of attitude importance in social evaluation: A study of policy preferences, presidential candidate evaluations, and voting behavior. Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A., Schuman, H., Carnot, C., Berent, M., & Boninger, D. (1987). Attitude importance and attitude accessibility. Paper presented at the Midwest Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Sedikides, C. (1987). Self-monitoring and self-protective biases in use of consensus information to predict one's own behavior. Paper presented at the Midwest Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A., Stephens, L., Jussim, L. J., & Lynn, A. R. (1987). Subliminal priming of affect and its cognitive consequences. Paper presented at the Midwest Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Alwin, D. F. (1987). Satisficing: A strategy for dealing with the demands of survey questions. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Hershey, Pennsylvania.
- Judd, C. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (1987). The structural bases of consistency among political attitudes: The effects of political expertise and attitude importance. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Annual Meeting, New York, New York.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Milburn, M. A. (1987). Psychological determinants of political opinionation. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1987). The role of attitude importance in social evaluation: A study of policy preferences, presidential candidate evaluations, and voting behavior. Paper presented at the Society for Experimental Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Charlottesville, Virginia.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1988). Psychological perspectives on political candidate perception: A review of research on the projection hypothesis. Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A., Boninger, D. S., Berent, M. K., & Carnot, C. G. (1988). The origins of attitude importance. Paper presented at the Midwest Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A., Carnot, C. G., Berent, M. K., & Boninger, D. S. (1988). An exploration of the relations among dimensions of attitude strength. Paper presented at the Midwest Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.

- Krosnick, J. A., Li, F., & Ashenhurst, J. (1988). Order of information presentation and the effect of base-rates on social judgments. Paper presented at the Midwest Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A., Berent, M. K., Carnot, C. G., & Boninger, D. S. (1988). Attitude importance and recall of attitude relevant information. Paper presented at the Midwest Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Carnot, C. G. (1988). A comparison of two theories of the origins of political attitude strength. Paper presented at the Midwest Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Alwin, D. F. (1988). The stability of political attitudes across the life span. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Toronto, Canada.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Carnot, C. G. (1988). Identifying the foreign affairs attentive public: A comparison of competing theories. Paper presented to the Mershon Center Seminar on Foreign Policy Decision Making, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
- Alwin, D. F., & Krosnick, J. A. (1988). The reliability of attitudinal survey data. Paper presented at the International Conference on Social Science Methodology, Dubrovnik, Yugoslavia.
- Alwin, D. F., & Krosnick, J. A. (1988). Aging, cohort stability, and change in socio-political attitudes: Exploring the generational-persistence model. Paper presented at the International Society of Political Psychology Annual Meeting, Secaucus, New Jersey.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Kinder, D. R. (1988). Altering the foundations of popular support for the president through priming: Reagan, the Iran-Contra affair, and the American public. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Weisberg, H. F. (1988). Liberal/conservative ideological structures in the mass public: A study of attitudes toward politicians and social groups. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1988). Government policy and citizen passion: A study of issue publics in contemporary America. Paper presented at the Shambaugh Conference on Communication, Cognition, Political Judgment, and Affect, Iowa City, Iowa.
- Berent, M. K., Krosnick, J. A., & Boninger, D. S. (1989). Attitude importance and the valenced recall of relevant information. Paper presented at the Midwest Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Betz, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (1989). Can people detect the affective tone of subliminally presented stimuli? Paper presented at the Midwest Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Berent, M. K. (1989). Age-related changes in peer and parental influence on heavy television viewing among children and adolescents. Paper presented at the Midwest Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Alwin, D. F., & Krosnick, J. A. (1989). The reliability of attitudinal survey data. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, St. Petersburg, Florida.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1989). The implications of social psychological findings on compliance for recruiting survey respondents. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, St. Petersburg, Florida.

- Telhami, S., & Krosnick, J. A. (1989). Public attitudes and American policy toward the Arab-Israeli conflict. Paper presented at the International Society of Political Psychology Annual Meeting, Israel.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Alwin, D. F. (1989). Symbolic versus non-symbolic political attitudes: Is there a distinction? Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Atlanta, Georgia.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1989). The impact of cognitive sophistication and attitude importance on response order effects and question order effects. Paper presented at the conference entitled Order effects in social and psychological research, Nags Head Conference Center, Kill Devil Hills, North Carolina.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1990). The impact of satisficing on survey data quality. Paper presented at the Annual Research Conference of the Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1990). New perspectives on survey questionnaire construction: Lessons from the cognitive revolution. Invited presentation at the 1990 Technical Conference of the United States General Accounting Office, College Park, Maryland.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1990). Americans' perceptions of presidential candidates: A test of the projection hypothesis. Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Berent, M. K. (1990). The impact of verbal labeling of response alternatives and branching on attitude measurement reliability in surveys. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Lancaster, Pennsylvania.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Alwin, D. F. (1990). The stability of political preferences: Comparisons of symbolic and non-symbolic attitudes. Paper presented at the International Society of Political Psychology Annual Meeting, Washington, D. C.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1990). Confounding of attitude objects with attitude measurement techniques in studies of political attitude stability. Paper presented at the Summer Institute in Survey Research Techniques, University of Michigan.
- Fabrigar, L. R., & Krosnick, J. A. (1991). The effect of question order and attitude importance on the false consensus effect. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Berent, M. K., & Krosnick, J. A. (1991). Attitude measurement reliability: The impact of verbal labeling of response alternatives and branching. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Lehman, D. R., Krosnick, J. A., West, R. L., & Li, F. (1991). The focus of judgment effect: A question wording effect due to hypothesis confirmation bias. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Krosnick, J. A., Boninger, D. S., Chuang, Y. C., & Carnot, C. G. (1991). Attitude strength: One construct or many related constructs? Paper presented at the Nags Head Conference on Attitude Strength, Nags Head, North Carolina.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1991). Research on attitude importance: A summary and integration. Paper presented at the Nags Head Conference on Attitude Strength, Nags Head, North Carolina.

- Krosnick, J. A., & Berent, M. K. (1991). Memory for political information: The impact of attitude importance on selective exposure, selective elaboration, and selective recall. Paper presented at the Society for Experimental Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Columbus, Ohio.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Brannon, L. A. (1992). The impact of war on the ingredients of presidential evaluations: George Bush and the Gulf conflict. Paper presented at the Conference on the Political Consequences of War, The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Berent, M. K., & Krosnick, J. A. (1992). The relation between attitude importance and knowledge structure. Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Smith, W. R., Culpepper, I. J., & Krosnick, J. A. (1992). The impact of question order on cognitive effort in survey responding. Paper presented at the Sixth National Conference on Undergraduate Research, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Brannon, L. A. (1992). The impact of war on the ingredients of presidential evaluations: George Bush and the Gulf conflict. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, St. Petersburg, Florida.
- Narayan, S. S., & Krosnick, J. A. (1992). Response effects in surveys as a function of cognitive sophistication. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Boninger, D. S., Krosnick, J. A., & Berent, M. K. (1992). Imagination, perceived likelihood, and self-interest: A path toward attitude importance. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Culpepper, I. J., Smith, W., & Krosnick, J. A. (1992). The impact of question order on satisficing in attitude surveys. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Berent, M. K., & Krosnick, J. A. (1992). Attitude importance, information accessibility, and attitude-relevant judgments. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Brannon, L. A. (1992). The impact of war on the ingredients of presidential evaluations: George Bush and the Gulf conflict. Paper presented at the International Society of Political Psychology Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California.
- Rahn, W. M., Krosnick, J. A., & Breuning, M. (1992). Rationalization and derivation processes in political candidate evaluation. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Brannon, L. A. (1992). Effects of knowledge, interest, and exposure on news media priming effects: Surprising results from multivariate analysis. Paper presented at the Society for Experimental Social Psychology Annual Meeting, San Antonio, Texas.
- Berent, M. K., & Krosnick, J. A. (1993). Attitude importance and selective exposure to attitude-relevant information. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Fabrigar, L. R., & Krosnick, J. A. (1993). The impact of personal and national importance judgments on political attitudes and behavior. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.

- Miller, J. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (1993). The effects of candidate ballot order on election outcomes. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Narayan, S. S., & Krosnick, J. A. (1993). Questionnaire and respondent characteristics that cause satisficing in attitude surveys. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Narayan, S. S., & Krosnick, J. A. (1993). Response effects in surveys as a function of cognitive sophistication. Paper presented at the American Psychological Society Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Smith, W. R., & Krosnick, J. A. (1993). Need for cognition, prior thought, and satisficing in attitude surveys. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Smith, W. R., & Krosnick, J. A. (1993). Cognitive and motivational determinants of satisficing in surveys. Paper presented at the American Psychological Society Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Berent, M. K., & Krosnick, J. A. (1994). Attitude importance and selective exposure to attitude-relevant information. Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Fabrigar, L. R., & Krosnick, J. A. (1994). The impact of attitude importance on consistency among attitudes. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1994). Survey methods and survey results: Overturning conventional wisdom. Paper presented to the American Marketing Association, Columbus Chapter.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Fabrigar, L. R. (1994). Attitude recall questions: Do they work? Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Danvers, Massachusetts.
- Miller, J. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (1994). Does accessibility mediate agenda-setting and priming? Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Smith, W. R., & Krosnick, J. A. (1994). Sources of non-differentiation and mental coin-flipping in surveys: Tests of satisficing hypotheses. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Danvers, Massachusetts.
- Visser, P. S., & Krosnick, J. A. (1994). Mail surveys for election forecasting? An evaluation of the Columbus Dispatch Poll. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Visser, P. S., Krosnick, J. A., & Curtin, M. (1994). Mail surveys for election forecasting? Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Danvers, Massachusetts.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Brannon, L. A. (1995). News media priming and the 1992 U.S. presidential election. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Cornet, P. J. (1995). Attitude importance and attitude change revisited: Shifts in attitude stability and measurement reliability across a presidential election campaign. Paper presented at the American Psychological Society Annual Meeting, New York, New York.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Fabrigar, L. R. (1995). Designing rating scales for effective measurement in surveys. Invited address at the International Conference on Survey Measurement and Process Quality, Bristol, England.

- Krosnick, J. A., Narayan, S. S., & Smith, W. R. (1995). The causes of survey satisficing: Cognitive skills and motivational factors. Paper presented at the Midwest Association for Public Opinion Research, Chicago, Illinois.
- Miller, J. M., Fabrigar, L. R., & Krosnick, J. A. (1995). Contrasting attitude importance and collective issue importance: Attitude properties and consequences. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Miller, J. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (1995). Ballot order effects on election outcomes. Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Miller, J. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (1995). Mediators and moderators of news media priming: It ain't accessibility, folks. Paper presented at the International Society of Political Psychology Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C.
- Narayan, S. S., & Krosnick, J. A. (1995). Education moderates response effects in surveys. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida.
- Smith, W. R., & Krosnick, J. A. (1995). Mental coin-flipping and non-differentiation in surveys: Tests of satisficing hypotheses. Invited address at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Visser, P. S., & Krosnick, J. A. (1995). The relation between age and susceptibility to attitude change: A new approach to an old question. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Visser, P. S., & Krosnick, J. A. (1995). Mail surveys win again: Some explanations for the superior accuracy of the Columbus Dispatch poll. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida.
- Ankerbrand, A. L., Krosnick, J. A., Cacioppo, J. T., & Visser, P. S. (1996). Candidate assessments and evaluative space. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Bizer, G. Y., & Krosnick, J. A. (1996). Attitude accessibility and importance revisited. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1996). Linking survey question structure to data quality: The impact of no-opinion options. Paper presented at the conference on "Quality Criteria in Survey Research," sponsored by the World Association for Public Opinion Research, Cadenabbia, Italy.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Brannon, L. A. (1996). News media priming during the 1992 U.S. presidential election campaign. Paper presented at the International Society of Political Psychology Annual Meeting, Vancouver, British Columbia.
- Miller, J. M., Fabrigar, L. R., & Krosnick, J. A. (1996). The roles of personal importance and national importance in motivating issue public membership. Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Miller, J. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (1996). Can issue public membership be triggered by the threat of a policy change? Paper presented at the International Society of Political Psychology Annual Meeting, Vancouver, British Columbia.

- Krosnick, J. A., & Visser, P. S. (1996). Changes in political attitude strength through the life cycle. Paper presented at the Society for Experimental Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Sturbridge, Massachusetts.
- Miller, J. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (1997). The impact of policy change threat on issue public membership. Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Ankerbrand, A. L., Krosnick, J. A., Cacioppo, J. T., Visser, P. S., & Gardner, W. (1997). Attitudes toward political candidates predict voter turnout. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Ankerbrand, A. L., & Krosnick, J. A. (1997). Response order effects in dichotomous questions: A social desirability explanation. Paper presented at the American Psychological Society Annual Meeting, Washington, DC.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1997). Miraculous accuracy in political surveys: The keys to success. Presentation in the Federation of Behavioral, Psychological, and Cognitive Sciences Seminar on Science and Public Policy, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1997). Non-attitudes and no-opinion filters. Paper presented at the Conference on no opinion, instability, and change in public opinion research. University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1997). Attitude strength. Paper presented at the Conference on no opinion, instability, and change in public opinion research. University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands.
- Bizer, G. Y., & Krosnick, J. A. (1998). The relation between attitude importance and attitude accessibility. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Holbrook, A., Krosnick, J. A., Carson, R. T., & Mitchell, R. C. (1998). Violating conversational conventions disrupts cognitive processing of survey questions. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, St. Louis, Missouri.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1998). Applying stated preference methods to assessing the value of public goods. Paper presented at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Application of Stated Preference Methods to Resource Compensation Workshop, Washington, DC.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1998). Implications of psychological research on justice and compensation for handling of natural resource damage cases. Paper presented at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Application of Stated Preference Methods to Resource Compensation Workshop, Washington, DC.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1998). Acquiescence: How a standard practice in many survey organizations compromises data quality. Paper presented at the conference on "Quality Criteria in Survey Research," sponsored by the World Association for Public Opinion Research, Cadenabbia, Italy.
- Krosnick, J. A., Lacy, D., & Lowe, L. (1998). When is environmental damage Americans' most important problem? A test of agenda-setting vs. the issue-attention cycle. Paper presented at the International Society of Political Psychology Annual Meeting, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.
- Visser, P. S., Krosnick, J. A., Marquette, J., & Curtin, M. (1998). Improving election forecasting: Allocation of undecided respondents, identification of likely voters, and response order effects. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, St. Louis, Missouri.

- Krosnick, J. A. (1998). The impact of science on public opinion: How people judge the national seriousness of global warming and form policy preferences. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1998). Response choice order and attitude reports: New evidence on conversational conventions and information processing biases in voting and in election forecasting polls. Paper presented at the Society of Experimental Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Lexington, Kentucky.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1998). The impact of the Fall 1997 debate about global warming on American public opinion. Paper presented at Resources for the Future, Washington, D.C.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1998). What the American public believes about global warming: Results of a national longitudinal survey study. Paper presented at the Amoco Public and Government Affairs and Government Relations Meeting, Woodruff, Wisconsin.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1998). What the American public believes about global warming: Results of a national longitudinal survey study. Paper presented in the Second Annual Carnegie Lectures on Global Environmental Change, Carnegie Museum of Natural History, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
- Green, M. C., & Krosnick, J. A. (1999). Survey satisficing: Telephone interviewing increases non-differentiation and no opinion responses. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Green, M. C., & Krosnick, J. A. (1999). Comparing telephone and face-to-face interviewing in terms of data quality: The 1982 National Election Studies Method Comparison Project. Paper presented at the Seventh Annual Conference on Health Survey Research Methods, Williamsburg, Virginia.
- Holbrook, A. L., Krosnick, J. A., Carson, R. T., & Mitchell, R. C. (1999). Violating conversational conventions disrupts cognitive processing of attitude questions. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, St. Petersburg, Florida.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1999). What happens when survey respondents don't try very hard? The notion of survey satisficing. Paper presented at the National Center for Social Research, London, United Kingdom.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1999). Satisficing: A single explanation for a wide range of findings in the questionnaire design literature. Paper presented at Linking the Path: A Conference for Analysts, Researchers, and Consultants, sponsored by the Gallup Organization, Lincoln, Nebraska.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1999). Methodology for the NAOMS Survey. Presentation at the Workshop on the Concept of the National Aviation Operational Monitoring System (NAOMS), Sponsored by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Alexandria, Virginia.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1999). Refining measurement of public values for policy-making: A test of contingent valuation procedures. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Atlanta, Georgia.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1999). The threat of satisficing in surveys: The shortcuts respondents take in answering questions. Paper presented at the National Center for Social Research Survey Methods Seminar on Survey Data Quality, London, England.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1999). Optimizing questionnaire design: How to maximise data quality. Paper presented at the National Center for Social Research Survey Methods Seminar on Survey Data Quality, London, England.

- Krosnick, J. A. (1999). The causes and consequences of no-opinion responses in surveys. Paper presented at the International Conference on Survey Nonresponse, Portland, Oregon.
- Miller, J. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (1999). The impact of threats and opportunities on political participation. Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- O'Muircheartaigh, C., Krosnick, J. A., & Helic, A. (1999). Middle alternatives, acquiescence, and the quality of questionnaire data. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, St. Petersburg, Florida.
- Bizer, G. Y., & Krosnick, J. A. (2000). The importance and accessibility of attitudes: Helping explain the structure of strength-related attitude attributes. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Holbrook, A. L., Krosnick, J. A., Visser, P. S., Gardner, W. L., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2000). The formation of attitudes toward presidential candidates and political parties: An asymmetric nonlinear process. Paper presented at the American Psychological Society Annual Meeting, Miami, Florida.
- Holbrook, A. L., Krosnick, J. A., Visser, P. S., Gardner, W. L., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2000). The formation of attitudes toward presidential candidates and political parties: An asymmetric, nonlinear, interactive process. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2000). Peering into the future of thinking and answering: A psychological perspective on internet survey respondents. Paper presented at *Survey Research: Past, Present, and Internet*, the 2000 Nebraska Symposium on Survey Research, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2000). The present and future of research on survey non-responses: Reflections on Portland '99 and beyond. Roundtable presentation at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Portland, Oregon.
- Holbrook, A. L., Krosnick, J. A., Moore, D. W., & Tourangeau, R. (2000). Response order effects in Gallup surveys: Linguistic structure and the impact of respondent ability, motivation, and task difficulty. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Portland, Oregon.
- Miller, J. M., Krosnick, J. A., & Lowe, L. (2000). The impact of policy change threat on financial contributions to interest groups. Paper presented at an invited conference, Political Participation: Building a Research Agenda, Center for the Study of Democratic Politics, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey.
- Miller, J. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (2000). Attitude change outside the laboratory: News media "priming" turns out not to be priming after all. Paper presented at the Society of Experimental Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Atlanta, Georgia.
- Saris, W., & Krosnick, J. A. (2000). The damaging effect of acquiescence response bias on answers to agree/disagree questions. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Portland, Oregon.
- Visser, P. S., & Krosnick, J. A. (2000). Exploring the distinct mechanisms through which strength-related attitude attributes confer resistance to attitude change. Paper presented at the Society for Personality and Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Nashville, Tennessee.
- Bizer, G. Y., & Krosnick, J. A. (2001). Need to evaluate and need for cognition predict political attitudes and behavior. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, Illinois.

- Krosnick, J. A. (2001). Who shapes public policy? Presentation made at the Annual Conference of the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, Columbus, Ohio.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Bizer, G. Y. (2001). Exploring the structure of strength-related attitude features: The relation between attitude importance and attitude accessibility. Paper presented at the Society for Personality and Social Psychology Annual Meeting, San Antonio, Texas.
- Krosnick, J. A., Visser, P. S., & Holbrook, A. L. (2001). Real-time attitude change outside the laboratory: The case of the 1997 national debate on global warming. Paper presented at the Society for Personality and Social Psychology Annual Meeting, San Antonio, Texas.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Miller, J. M. (2001). An unrecognized need for ballot reform: Effects of candidate name order. Paper presented at the conference entitled Election Reform: 2000 and Beyond, sponsored by the USC-Caltech Center for the Study of Law and Politics and the Jesse M. Unruh Institute of Politics, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California.
- Miller, J. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (2001). What motivates political cognition and behavior? Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Green, M. C., Krosnick, J. A., & Holbrook, A. L. (2001). Experimental comparisons of the quality of data obtained from face-to-face and telephone surveys. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Montreal, Canada.
- Silver, M. D., & Krosnick, J. A. (2001). An experimental comparison of the quality of data obtained in telephone and self-administered mailed surveys with a listed sample. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Montreal, Canada.
- Chang, L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2001). The representativeness of national samples: Comparisons of an RDD telephone survey with matched Internet surveys by Harris Interactive and Knowledge Networks. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Montreal, Canada.
- Chang, L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2001). The accuracy of self-reports: Comparisons of an RDD telephone survey with Internet Surveys by Harris Interactive and Knowledge Networks. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Montreal, Canada.
- O'Muircheartaigh, C., & Krosnick, J. A. (2001). A cross-national comparison of middle alternatives, acquiescence, and the quality of questionnaire data. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Montreal, Canada.
- Marquette, J., Green, J., & Krosnick, J. A. (2001). Experimental analysis of the accuracy of pre-election vote choice reports. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Montreal, Canada.
- Holbrook, A. L., Krosnick, J. A., Carson, R. T., & Mitchell, R. C. (2001). Violating conversational conventions disrupts cognitive processing of attitude questions. Paper presented at the 2001 Fifth Tri-Annual UC Berkeley Invitational Choice Symposium, Pacific Grove, California.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2001). Americans' perceptions of the health risks of cigarette smoking: A new opportunity for public education. Paper presented at the invited conference "Survey Research on Household Expectations and Preferences," Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

- McCready, W., Skitka, L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2001). Using a web-enabled national panel to conduct social psychological experiments. Workshop presented at the Society of Experimental Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Spokane, Washington.
- Krosnick, J. A., Courser, M., Mulligan, K., & Chang, L. (2001). Exploring the determinants of vote choices in the 2000 Presidential election: Longitudinal analyses to document causality. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California.
- Silver, M. D., & Krosnick, J. A. (2001). Optimizing survey measurement accuracy by matching question design to respondent memory organization. Paper presented at the Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology Research Conference, Arlington, Virginia.
- Krosnick, J. A., Courser, M., Mulligan, K., & Chang, L. (2002). Exploring the causes of vote choice in the 2000 Presidential election: Longitudinal analyses to document the causal determinants of candidate preferences. Paper presented at a conference entitled "Assessing the Vitality of Electoral Democracy in the U.S.: The 2000 Election," The Mereson Center, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
- Miller, J. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (2002). Mediators and moderators of news media agenda-setting. Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Shaeffer, E. M., Krosnick, J. A., & Holbrook, A. L. (2002). Assessing the efficacy of object rankings following ratings. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Lampron, S., Krosnick, J. A., Petty, R. E., & See, M. (2002). Self-interest, values, involvement, and susceptibility to attitude change. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2002). Comments on Baruch Fischhoff's "Environmental Risk: What's Worth Knowing – and Saying?" Paper presented at the 2nd Annual Public Policy Symposium, "Responding to Contemporary Environmental Risks." Sponsored by the Ohio State University Environmental Policy Initiative, Fischer College of Business, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
- Thomas, R. K., Uldall, B. R., & Krosnick, J. A. (2002). More is not necessarily better: Effects of response categories on measurement stability and validity. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, St. Petersburg, Florida.
- Uldall, B. R., Thomas, R. K., & Krosnick, J. A. (2002). Reliability and validity of web-based surveys: Effects of response modality, item format, and number of categories. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, St. Petersburg, Florida.
- Shook, N., Krosnick, J. A., & Thomas, R. K. (2002). Following the storm: Public opinion changes and political reactions in surveys. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, St. Petersburg, Florida.
- Chang, L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2002). Comparing self-administered computer surveys and auditory interviews: An experiment. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, St. Petersburg, Florida.
- Silver, M. D., & Krosnick, J. A. (2002). Optimizing survey measurement accuracy by matching question design to respondent memory organization. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, St. Petersburg, Florida.

- Krosnick, J. A., Visser, P. S., Holbrook, A. L., & Berent, M. K. (2002). Challenging the common-factor model of strength-related attitude attributes: Contrasting the antecedents and consequences of attitude importance and attitude-relevant knowledge. Paper presented at the General Meeting of the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology, San Sebastian, Spain.
- Krosnick, J. A., Miller, J. M., & Tichy, M. P. (2002). An unrecognized need for ballot reform: Effects of candidate name order. Paper presented at the International Society for Political Psychology Annual Meeting, Berlin, Germany.
- Chang, L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2002). RDD telephone vs. Internet survey methodology for studying American presidential elections: Comparing sample representativeness and response quality. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Bizer, G. Y., Krosnick, J. A., Holbrook, A. L., Petty, R. E., Rucker, D. D., & Wheeler, S. C. (2002). The impact of personality on electoral behavior and cognition: A study of need for cognition and need to evaluate. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Krosnick, J. A., Visser, P. S., & Holbrook, A. L. (2002). Social psychology under the microscope: Do classic experiments replicate when participants are representative of the general public rather than convenience samples of college students? Paper presented at the Society of Experimental Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Columbus, Ohio.
- Visser, P. S., Krosnick, J. A., Simmons, J. (2002). Distinguishing the cognitive and behavioral consequences of attitude importance and certainty. Paper presented at the Society of Experimental Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Columbus, Ohio.
- Chang, L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2002). RDD telephone vs. Internet survey methodology for studying American presidential elections: Comparing sample representativeness and response quality. Invited presentation at Westat, Rockville, Maryland.
- Chang, L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2002). Comparing the quality of data obtained from telephone and Internet surveys: Field and laboratory experiments. Invited paper presented at the FCSM Statistical Policy Seminar "Challenges to the Federal Statistical System in Fostering Access to Statistics." Bethesda, Maryland.
- Lampron, S. F., Krosnick, J. A., Shaeffer, E., Petty, R. E., & See, M. (2003). Different types of involvement moderate persuasion (somewhat) differently: Contrasting outcome-based and value-based involvement. Paper presented at the Society for Personality and Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Los Angeles, California.
- Visser, P. S., & Krosnick, J. A. (2003). Attitude strength: New insights from a life-course development perspective. Paper presented at the Society for Personality and Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Los Angeles, California.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2003). Basic methodological work for and in repeated cross-sectional and longitudinal surveys: A few thoughts. Paper presented at the National Science Foundation Workshop on Repeated Cross-sectional and Longitudinal Surveys, Arlington, Virginia.
- Pfent, A. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (2003). Rationalization of presidential candidate preferences. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.

- Holbrook, A. L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2003). Meta-psychological and operative measures of psychological constructs: The same or different? Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A., Visser, P. S., & Holbrook, A. L. (2003). Social psychology under the microscope: Do classic experiments replicate when participants are representative of the general public rather than convenience samples of college students? Invited presentation at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Saris, W. E., Krosnick, J. A., & Shaeffer, E. M. (2003). Comparing the quality of agree/disagree and balanced forced choice questions via an MTMM experiment. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Anand, S., & Krosnick, J. A. (2003). Satisficing in attitude surveys: The impact of cognitive skills and motivation on response effects. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Bizer, G. Y., Krosnick, J. A., Holbrook, A. L., Petty, R. E., Rucker, D. D., & Wheeler, S. C. (2003). The impact of personality on political beliefs, attitudes, and behavior: Need for cognition and need to evaluate. Paper presented at the American Psychological Society Annual Meeting, Atlanta, Georgia.
- Holbrook, A. L., Pfent, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2003). Response rates in recent surveys conducted by non-profits and commercial survey agencies and the news media. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Nashville, Tennessee.
- Shaeffer, E. M., Langer, G. E., Merkle, D. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (2003). A comparison of minimal balanced and fully balanced forced choice items. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Nashville, Tennessee.
- Pfent, A., Krosnick, J. A., & Courser, M. (2003). Rationalization and derivation processes in presidential elections: New evidence about the determinants of citizens' vote choices. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Nashville, Tennessee.
- Krosnick, J. A., Visser, P. S., & Holbrook, A. L. (2003). How to conceptualize attitude strength and how to measure it in surveys: Psychological perspectives. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Nashville, Tennessee.
- Chang, L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2003). Comparing data quality in telephone and internet surveys: Results of lab and field experiments. Invited paper presented at the American Statistical Association Annual Meetings, San Francisco, California.
- Pfent, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2003). Post-decisional dissonance reduction by a new method: Rationalization of political candidate choices illuminates the basic dynamics of decision-making. Paper presented at the Society of Experimental Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Fabrigar, L. R. (2003). "Don't know" and "no opinion" responses: What they mean, why they occur, and how to discourage them. Invited paper presented at the Basel Workshop on Item Non-response and Data Quality in Large Social Surveys, University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2003). Comments on theories of persuasion. Invited discussant at the conference entitled "Integrating Message Effects and Behavior Change Theories in Cancer Prevention, Treatment, and Care," Annenberg Public Policy Center, Annenberg School for Communication, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

- Krosnick, J. A. (2003). Survey methodology – scientific basis. Presentation at the National Aviation Operations Monitoring Service Working Group Meeting #1, Seattle, Washington.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2003). Survey methodology – NAOMS design decisions. Presentation at the National Aviation Operations Monitoring Service Working Group Meeting #1, Seattle, Washington.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2004). Survey methodology – scientific basis. Presentation at the National Transportation Safety Board, Washington, DC.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2004). Survey methodology – NAOMS design decisions. Presentation at the National Transportation Safety Board, Washington, DC.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2004). Public uses of the news media. Presentation as a part of the symposium “Politics and the media,” Social Sciences Resource Center, Stanford Libraries, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2004). Peering into the minds of respondents: The cognitive and social processes underlying answers to survey questions. Invited keynote lecture at the International Symposium in Honour of Paul Lazarsfeld, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (Belgium).
- Krosnick, J. A., Shook, N., & Thomas, R. K. (2004). Public opinion change in the aftermath of 9/11. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Holbrook, A. L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2004). Vote over-reporting: A test of the social desirability hypothesis. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Chang, L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2004). Assessing the accuracy of event rate estimates from national surveys. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Shaeffer, E. M., Lampron, S. F., Krosnick, J. A., Tompson, T. N., Visser, P. S., & Hanemann, W. M. (2004). A comparison of open vs. closed survey questions for valuing environmental goods. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Holbrook, A. L., Berent, M. K., Krosnick, J. A., Visser, P. S., & Boninger, D. S. (2004). Attitude importance and the accumulation of attitude-relevant knowledge in memory. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Chang, L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2004). Measuring the frequency of regular behaviors: Comparing the ‘typical week’ to the ‘past week.’ Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2004). What do Americans want government to do about global warming? Evidence from national surveys. Invited presentation at the “Workshop on Global Warming: The Psychology of Long Term Risk,” Cooperative Institute for Climate Science, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Malhotra, N. (2004). The causes of vote choice in the 2004 American Presidential Election: Insights from the 2004 YouGov surveys. Paper presented at the conference “The 2004 American Presidential Election: Voter Decision-Making in a Complex World,” Stanford University, Stanford, California.

- Krosnick, J. A., Visser, P. S., & Holbrook, A. L. (2004). The impact of social psychological manipulations embedded in surveys on special populations. Paper presented at the Pacific Chapter of the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2005). The future of the American National Election Studies. Roundtable: The political psychology of surveys. Paper presented at the Midwestern Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Malhotra, N., & Krosnick, J. A. (2005). What motivated Americans' views of the candidates and vote preferences across the 2004 presidential campaign? Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Miami, Florida.
- Garland, P., Krosnick, J. A., & Clark, H. H. (2005). Does question wording sometimes send unintended signals about expected answers? Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Miami, Florida.
- Callegaro, M., De Keulenaer, F., Krosnick, J. A., & Daves, R. (2005). Interviewer effects in an RDD telephone pre-election poll in Minneapolis 2001: An analysis of the effects of interviewer race and gender. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Miami, Florida.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Rivers, D. (2005). Web survey methodologies: A comparison of survey accuracy. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Miami, Florida.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Rivers, D. (2005). Comparing major survey firms in terms of survey satisficing: Telephone and internet data collection. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Miami, Florida.
- Holbrook, A. L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2005). Vote over-reporting: Testing the social desirability hypothesis in telephone and internet surveys. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Miami, Florida.
- Anand, S., Krosnick, J. A., Mulligan, K., Smith, W., Green, M., & Bizer, G. (2005). Effects of respondent motivation and task difficulty on nondifferentiation in ratings: A test of satisficing theory predictions. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Miami, Florida.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2005). Thought piece on survey participation. Paper presented at the conference entitled "New Approaches to Understanding Participation in Surveys," Belmont Conference Center, Elkridge, Maryland.
- Malhotra, N., & Krosnick, J. A. (2005). Pilot test of new procedures for identifying new and emerging occupations and their places in the SOC: A study of biotechnology. Paper presented at the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, DC.
- Holbrook, A. L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2005). Do survey respondents intentionally lie and claim that they voted when they did not? New evidence using the list and randomized response techniques. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Washington, DC.
- Malhotra, N., & Krosnick, J. A. (2005). The determinants of vote choice in the 2004 U.S. Presidential Election. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Washington, DC.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2005). Effects of survey data collection mode on response quality: Implications for mixing modes in cross-national studies. Paper presented at the conference "Mixed Mode Data Collection in Comparative Social Surveys," City University, London, United Kingdom.

- Krosnick, J. A., & Malhotra, N. (2006). The impact of presidential job performance assessments on vote choices in 2004. Paper presented at the conference "The Wartime Election of 2004," Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
- Rabinowitz, J. L. & Krosnick, J. A. (2006). Investigating the discriminant validity of symbolic racism. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Palm Springs, California.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2006). An evaluation framework: Total survey error in research practice. Paper presented at the Survey Methods Symposium sponsored by Central Market Research and Insights, Microsoft, Redmond, Washington.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2006). Data quality from phone vs. internet surveys. Paper presented at the Survey Methods Symposium sponsored by Central Market Research and Insights, Microsoft, Redmond, Washington.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2006). The distinguishing characteristics of frequent survey participants. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2006). An overview of the mission of the American National Election Studies. Presentation at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2006). The use of the internet in valuation surveys. Presentation at the workshop "Morbidity and Mortality: How Do We Value the Risk of Illness and Death?", sponsored by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the National Center for Environmental Research, and the National Council on Economic Education, Washington, DC.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2006). What the American public thinks about climate change: Findings from a new Stanford/ABC/Time Magazine Survey. Presentation at the "California Climate Change Policy Workshop," sponsored by the Woods Institute for the Environment, California State Capital Building, Sacramento, California.
- Holbrook, A. L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2006). Vote over-reporting: A test of the social desirability hypothesis. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Bannon, B., Krosnick, J. A., & Brannon, L. (2006). News media priming: Derivation or rationalization? Paper presented at the American Political Science Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- Malhotra, N., Krosnick, J. S., & Thomas, R. (2006). The effect of polls on political behavior. Paper presented at the American Political Science Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2006). Doing social psychology that's relevant and valued and valuable. Paper presented at the Society of Experimental Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2006). Overview of the American National Election Studies: Lessons learned about the causes of voter turnout and candidate choice. Paper presented at the conference "The Psychology of Voting and Election Campaigns," Social Science Research Institute, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina.

- Krosnick, J. A. (2006). What Americans really think about climate change. Presentation to the Stanford Women's Club of the East Bay, Contra Costa County Library, Orinda, California.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2006). The impact of survey mode and the merging of face-to-face recruitment with Internet data collection. Paper presented at the 2006 Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology Statistical Policy Seminar, "Keeping Current: What We Know – What We Need to Learn." Washington, DC.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2006). Comparisons of the accuracy of information obtained by face-to-face, telephone, internet, and paper and pencil data collection. Paper presented at the Pacific Chapter of the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California.
- Bizer, G. Y., Krosnick, J. A., Holbrook, A. L., Wheeler, S. C., Rucker, D. D., & Petty, R. E. (2007). The impact of personality on political beliefs, attitudes, and behavior: Need for cognition and need to evaluate. Paper presented at the Society for Personality and Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Memphis, Tennessee.
- Sargent, M. J., Rabinowitz, J., Shull, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2007). Support for government efforts to promote racial equality: Effects of antigroup affect and perceptions of value violation. Paper presented at the Society for Personality and Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Memphis, Tennessee.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2007). Americans' beliefs about global climate change: New national survey findings. Paper presented at the American Association for the Advancement of Science Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2007). Comparisons of survey modes and a new hybrid. Paper presented at the American Association for the Advancement of Science Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California.
- Garland, P., & Krosnick, J. A. (2007). The impact of race on evaluations of artistic products: Evidence of 'ownership' bias among prejudiced whites. Paper presented at the National Conference of Black Political Scientists, Burlingame, California.
- Lupia, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2007). Remaking the American National Election Studies. Paper presented at the National Conference of Black Political Scientists, Burlingame, California.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2007). What Americans really think about climate change: Attitude formation and change in response to a raging scientific controversy. Presentation sponsored by the California Research Bureau at the California State House, Sacramento, California.
- Harbridge, L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2007). Presidential approval and gas prices: The Bush presidency in historical context. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research annual meeting, Garden Grove, California.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Smith, T. (2007). Proposing questionnaire design experiments for the General Social Survey. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research annual meeting, Garden Grove, California.
- Cote, F., Tahk, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2007). Comparing the validity of public predictions of changes in the economy: RDD telephone data vs. volunteer samples completing paper and pencil questionnaires. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research annual meeting, Garden Grove, California.

- Schneider, D., Krosnick, J. A., & Ophir, E. (2007). Ballot order effects in California from 1976 to 2006. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research annual meeting, Garden Grove, California.
- O'Muircheartaigh, C., Krosnick, J. A., & Dennis, J. M. (2007). Face-to-face recruitment of an Internet survey panel: Lessons from an NSF-sponsored demonstration project. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research annual meeting, Garden Grove, California.
- Malhotra, N., & Krosnick, J. A. (2007). The effect of survey mode and sampling on inferences about political attitudes and behavior: Comparing the 2000 and 2004 ANES to Internet surveys with non-probability samples. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research annual meeting, Garden Grove, California.
- Krosnick, J. A., Malhotra, N., & Miller, L. (2007). Survey mode in the 21st Century: Probability vs. non-probability samples of a nation's population. Paper presented at the conference entitled "Cyberinfrastructure and National Election Studies: The Wivenhoe House Conference." University of Essex, Colchester, UK.
- Pasek, J., & Krosnick, J. A. (2007). Trends over time in America: Probability/telephone vs. non-probability/internet. Paper presented at the conference entitled "Cyberinfrastructure and National Election Studies: The Wivenhoe House Conference." University of Essex, Colchester, UK.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2007). Methods and results from the New Scientist Survey on Climate Change Policy. Presentation at the National Press Club, Washington, DC.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2007). The ANES Recompetition and its Implications for the GSS recompetition. Presentation at the American Sociological Association annual meeting, New York, New York.
- Harder, J., & Krosnick, J. A., (2007). Causes of voter turnout: A social psychological perspective. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association annual meeting, San Francisco, California.
- Schneider, D., Berent, M. K., Thomas, R., & Krosnick, J. A. (2007). Measuring customer satisfaction and loyalty: Improving the 'net promoter' score. Paper presented at the World Association for Public Opinion Research annual meeting, Berlin, Germany.
- Cobb, C., & Krosnick, J. A. (2007). The impact of postdoc appointments on science and engineering career outcomes and job satisfaction. Paper presented at the conference "Using Human Resource Data", Science Resources Statistics Workshop, Washington, DC.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2007). Some of the lessons learned from analyses of data from the American National Election Studies. Presentation at a conference facilitating learning about the American National Election Studies by leading news media pollsters. Gallup World Headquarters, Washington, DC.
- Berent, M. K., & Krosnick, J. A. (2007). For example ... How different cue types in survey questions influence frequency. Pacific Association for Public Opinion Research, San Francisco, California.
- Schneider, D., Krosnick, J. A., Ofir, E., Milligan, C., Tahk, A. (2008). The psychology of voting: How and why the order of candidate names on the ballot and election laws influence election outcomes. Society for Personality and Social Psychology annual meeting, Albuquerque, New Mexico.
- Saller, R., & Krosnick, J. A. (2008). Modern democracy and the Roman Empire: Ancient perspectives on the 2008 elections. The Claremont Hotel, Berkeley, California.

- Pasek, J., & Krosnick, J. A. (2008). Marketing of political candidates and voter choice. Paper presented at the Association for Consumer Research Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California.
- Breent, M. K., & Krosnick, J. A. (2008). For example ... How different example types in online surveys influence frequency estimates. Paper presented at the General Online Research 2008 Conference, Hamburg, Germany.
- Bowen, K., Visser, P., Krosnick, J. A., & Anand, S. (2008). Embedded attitudes: How social network features regulate individual-level attitude strength. Paper presented at the Association for Psychological Science Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Pasek, J., DeBell, M., & Krosnick, J. A. (2008). Measuring voters' values in the American National Election Studies. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Malhotra, N., Yee, N., Krosnick, J. A., Scott, A., Thomas, R. K., Anand, S., & Chang, L. (2008). Response order effects in rating scales. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Berent, M., & Krosnick, J. A. (2008). "For example": How different example types in online surveys influence frequency estimates. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Blocksom, D. T., Schneider, D., & Krosnick, J. A. (2008). Moderators of the name-order effect: The 2004 Presidential Election in Ohio. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Holbrook, A. L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2008). Results of the 2008 ANES voter turnout experiment. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Schneider, D., Berent, M. K., Thomas, R. K., & Krosnick, J. A. (2008). Measuring customer satisfaction and loyalty: improving the 'net-promoter' score. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Wang, R., & Krosnick, J. A. (2008). Comparing the results of probability and non-probability telephone and internet survey data. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Malhotra, N., & Krosnick, J. A. Perceptions of mass opinion and voting in presidential primaries. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Krosnick, J. A., Yeager, D., & Wang, R. (2008). The validity of political surveys with non-probability samples of respondents who volunteer to answer questions for money. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Pasek, J. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (2008). Studying trends in public opinion over time with probability sample surveys and surveys of people who volunteer to do surveys for money. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Thomas, R. K., & Krosnick, J. A. (2008). Number of response categories and scale compression: Effects on validity and reliability. Paper presented at the Seventh International Conference on Social Science Methodology – RC33 – Logic and Methodology in Sociology, Naples, Italy.

- Malka, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2009). Conservative-liberal self-label and responsiveness to ideological cues. Paper presented at the Society for Personal and Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Tampa, Florida.
- Cobb, C., & Krosnick, J. A. (2009). Experimental test of the accuracy of proxy reports compared to target report with third-party validity. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Hollywood, Florida.
- Yeager, D., & Krosnick, J. A. (2009). Does weighting improve the accuracy of data from non-probability internet survey panels of people who volunteer to do surveys for money? Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Hollywood, Florida.
- Payne, K., Lelkes, Y., Krosnick, J. A., Akhtar, O., Pasek, J., & Thompson, T. (2009). The effect of implicit prejudice on vote choice during the 2008 Presidential election: Insights from the Associated Press-Yahoo! News-Stanford University study. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Hollywood, Florida.
- Pasek, J., Krosnick, J. A., Akhtar, O., Lelkes, Y., Payne, K., & Thompson, T. (2009). A new approach to simultaneous modeling of the causes of turnout and candidate choice with data collected before elections: Insights from the Associated Press-Yahoo! News-Stanford University study. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Hollywood, Florida.
- Yeager, D., & Krosnick, J. A. (2009). Comparison study of probability and non-probability sample surveys conducted by Internet and face to face. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Hollywood, Florida.
- DeBell, M., Krosnick, J. A., Malka, A., Ackermann, A., & Turakhia, C. (2009). Assessing the FFISP's representative of the American adult population. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Hollywood, Florida.
- Krosnick, J. A., Ackermann, A., DeBell, M., Malka, A., & Turakhia, C. (2009). A comparison of behavioral and attitudinal findings from the FFISP with those of major national surveys. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Hollywood, Florida.
- Ackermann, A., Krosnick, J. A., Turakhia, C., DeBell, M., Malka, A., & Jarmon, R. (2009). Lessons learned about how to accomplish effective in-person recruitment of a web-equipped survey panel. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Hollywood, Florida.
- Sakshaug, J., Tourangeau, R., Krosnick, J. A., Ackerman, A., Malka, A., DeBell, M., & Turakhia, C. (2009). Dispositions and outcome rates in the Face-to-face Internet Survey Platform (the FFISP). Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Hollywood, Florida.
- Lelkes, Y., Krosnick, J. A., Akhtar, O., Pasek, J., & Thompson, T., & Payne, K. (2009). An exploration of the forces driving vote choices in the 2008 American Presidential Election: Insights from the Associated Press-Yahoo! News-Stanford University study. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Hollywood, Florida.
- Light, A. E., Visser, P. S., Krosnick, J. A., & Anand, S. (2009). Variability without and within: Self-concept clarity and varied social networks. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.

- Krosnick, J. A., Ackermann, A., Malka, A., Yeager, D., Sakshaug, J., Tourangeau, R., DeBell, M., & Turakhia, C. (2009). Creating the face-to-face recruited internet survey platform (FFRISP). Paper presented at the Third Annual Workshop on Measurement and Experimentation with Internet Panels: Innovative Features of Internet Interviewing, Santpoort Noord, the Netherlands.
- Krosnick, J. A., Achermann, A., Malka, A., Yeager, D., Sakshaug, J., Tourangeau, R., DeBell, M., & Turakhia, C. (2009). Creation of a new representative sample Internet survey panel via face-to-face recruitment and providing free computers to all respondents: Evaluation of the FFISP. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Toronto, Canada.
- Krosnick, J. A., Pasek, J., Tahk, A., Lelkes, Y., Payne, K., Tompson, T., & Akhtar, O. (2009). The 2008 American Presidential election: An exploration of the forces driving vote choices. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Toronto, Canada.
- Krosnick, J. A., Lupia, A., & DeBell, M. (2009). The activities of the American National Election Studies. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Toronto, Canada.
- Yeager, D., Krosnick, J. A., Holbrook, A. L., & Visser, P. S. (2010). Pulling social psychology out of the laboratory, kicking and screaming. Paper presented at the Society for Personality and Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Las Vegas, Nevada.
- Gross, W., & Krosnick, J. A. (2010). Issue publics and candidate evaluations: Explaining inconsistent results in the moderation of issue agreement by individual issue importance. Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meetings, Chicago, Illinois.
- Gross, W., Kropko, J., Krosnick, J. A., Macdonald, S. E., & Rabinowitz, G. (2010). The influence of personal importance in issue voting models. Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meetings, Chicago, Illinois.
- Kim, N., & Krosnick, J. A. (2010). Moderators of candidate name order effects. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Conference, Chicago, Illinois.
- DeBell, M., Villar, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2010). Measuring the number of land line and cellular telephones used for voice calls in households to properly weight RDD surveys for unequal probability of selection. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Conference, Chicago, Illinois.
- Pasek, J., DeBell, M., & Krosnick, J. A. (2010). Toward a standardization of survey weights: The American National Election Studies weighting system. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Conference, Chicago, Illinois.
- Lelkes, Y., Krosnick, J. A., Marx, D. M., Judd, C. M., & Park, B. (2010). Unmotivated anonymity: Social desirability, accuracy, and satisficing under conditions of anonymity. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Conference, Chicago, Illinois.
- Sood, G., Krosnick, J. A., & DeBell, M. (2010). Differences between confidentially and orally administered overt racism measures: Evidence from the 2008 ANES. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Conference, Chicago, Illinois.
- Tompson, T., Krosnick, J. A., Junius, D., & Pasek, J. (2010). Support for health care reform: It all depends on how you ask the question. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Conference, Chicago, Illinois.

- Pasek, J., Tompson, T., & Krosnick, J. A. (2010). Who supports health care reform? Explaining the determinants of support for various health care reforms. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Conference, Chicago, Illinois.
- Yeager, D. S., Carter, A., Tewoldemedhin, H., & Krosnick, J. A. (2010). Study of non-probability sample internet surveys' estimates of consumer product usage and demographic characteristics of consumer product users. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Conference, Chicago, Illinois.
- Berent, M. K., Krosnick, J. A., & DeBell, M. (2010). Confirming the validity of survey respondent reports of voter registration and turnout: Checking the records turns up surprisingly bad news. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Conference, Chicago, Illinois.
- Villar, A., Malka, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2010). Assessing the accuracy of the Face-to-Face Recruited Internet Survey Platform: A comparison of behavioral and health-related findings from the FFRISP with those of major national surveys. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Conference, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krosnick, J. A., Malka, A., & Villar, A. (2010). Manipulation of public opinion on global warming: The impact of news media coverage and the weather. Paper presented at the International Society of Political Psychology Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California.
- Shockley, E., Krosnick, J. A., & Visser, P. S. (2010). The impact of aging on political ideology. Paper presented at the International Society of Political Psychology Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California.
- Yeager, D., Krosnick, J. A., Tewoldemedhin, H., & Carter, A. (2010). Evaluating non-probability sample internet surveys' estimates of consumer product usage and demographic characteristics of consumer product users: Do different panels produce the same results? Paper presented at the Fourth Annual Workshop on Measurement and Experimentation with Internet Panels: Innovative Features of Internet Interviewing, Noordwijk, the Netherlands.
- Krosnick, J. A., Tompson, T., & Villar, A. (2010). Change in public opinion about climate change 2006-2010: How trusted sources and personal experience combine. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Washington, DC.
- Gera, K. Yeager, D., Krosnick, J. A., DeBell, M., & McDonald, M. (2010). Comparing estimates of voter turnout from the American National Election Studies, the General Social Survey, and the Current Population Survey. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Washington, DC.
- Pasek, J., Krosnick, J. A., & Tompson, T. (2010). Taking a position on health care: Selfish, group interest, and sociotropic determinants of citizens' attitudes on proposals for health care reform. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Washington, DC.
- Sood, G., & Krosnick, J. A. (2010). The impact of satire in television news: Differential impact on the usual audience and on other viewers. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Washington, DC.
- Tahk, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2010). Do the news media shape how Americans think about politics? New statistical procedures cast new light on an old hypothesis. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Washington, DC.

- Kim, N., & Krosnick, J. A. (2010). Moderators of candidate name order effects. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Washington, DC.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2010). We just want to help: How social science can sometimes be successful and sometimes crash and burn when in the public spotlight. Paper presented at the Society of Experimental Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- Berent, M. K., Krosnick, J. A., & Lupia, A. (2011). Lying survey respondents or flawed government records? An examination of turnout over-reporting and vote validation in the 2008 ANES Panel Study. Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Cobb, C., Krosnick, J. A., & Bannon, B. (2011). Optimizing the design of a question intended to measure expected starting salary. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.
- MacInnis, B., & Krosnick, J. A. (2011). The persistence of American public opinion on climate policy. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Yeager, D. S., Larson, S., & Krosnick, J. A. (2011). Measuring Americans' issue priorities: A new version of the most important problem question reveals more concern about global warming and the environment. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2011). The stability of American public opinion on global warming: Towards explaining the existence beliefs trends. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Romano Bergstrom, J. C., Olmsted-Hawala, E. L., Rogers, W. A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2011). Age-related differences in reported computer and internet usage based on question type: 'A great deal' of variability. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Jans, M., Bergstrom, J. C., Ashenfelter, K. T., & Krosnick, J. A. (2011). Measuring user satisfaction in the lab: Questionnaire mode, physical location, and social presence concerns. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.
- MacInnis, B., & Krosnick, J. A. (2011). Complete satisficing in surveys: An exploratory investigation. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Yeager, D. S., & Krosnick, J. A. (2011). Does mentioning 'some people' and 'other people' in an attitude question improve measurement quality? Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Chang, L., Krosnick, J. A., & Tompson, T. (2011). The impact of healthcare utilization on satisfaction with health insurance plans. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Chang, L. & Krosnick, J. A. (2011). Assessing survey accuracy across multiple domains. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Pasek, J., & Krosnick, J. A. (2011). Measuring intent to participate and participation in the 2010 census and their correlates and trends: Comparisons of RDD telephone and non-probability sample internet survey data. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.

- Weiss, R., Krosnick, J. A., & Yeager, D. S. (2011). More comparisons of probability and non-probability sample internet surveys: The Dutch NOPVO study. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Gilbert, E., Allum, N., Villar, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2011). Do reluctant respondents provide poor data? Evidence from the Face-to-Face Recruited Internet Survey Platform (FFRISP). Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Lelkes, Y., & Krosnick, J. A. (2011). Measuring perceptions and probabilities: Verbal or numerical response options? Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Krosnick, J. A., MacInnis, B., & Villar, A. (2011). The impact of candidates' statements about climate change on electoral success in 2008 and 2010: Evidence using three methodologies. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Seattle, Washington.
- Berent, M. K., Krosnick, J. A., & Lupia, A. (2011). Measuring voter registration and turnout in surveys: Do official government records yield more accurate assessments? Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Seattle, Washington.
- Krosnick, J. A., MacInnis, B., & Villar, A. (2012). Polarization of opinions about global warming between 1997 and 2011: Appearances are sometimes misleading. Paper presented at the Society for Personality and Social Psychology Annual Meeting, San Diego, California.
- MacInnis, B., Krosnick, J. A., & Villar, A. (2012). Motivated social cognition in the realm of politics: The case of news media dissemination of information about climate change. Paper presented at the Society for Personality and Social Psychology Annual Meeting, San Diego, California.
- Villar, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2012). An investigation of nonresponse error due to breakoffs in telephone surveys. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Orlando, Florida.
- Anand, S., Krosnick, J. A., & Yeager, D. S. (2012). What number of scale points in an attitude question optimizes response validity and administrative practicality? Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Orlando, Florida.
- Kim, N., Lelkes, Y., & Krosnick, J. A. (2012). Race of interviewer effects in the 2008 Presidential election. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Orlando, Florida.
- Berent, M. K., Krosnick, J. A., & Lupia, A. (2012). Lying vs. fail-to-match: Self-reported turnout and validated turnout in the 2008-2009 ANES Panel Study. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Orlando, Florida.
- Young, C., Jackson, C., & Krosnick, J. A. (2012). Comparison of dual frame telephone and non-probability online panels regarding accuracy of political opinion polling. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Orlando, Florida.
- Callegaro, M., Villar, A., Krosnick, J. A., & Yeager, D. S. (2012). A systematic review of studies investigating the quality of data obtained with online panels. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Orlando, Florida.

- Weiss, R. J., Berent, M. K., Krosnick, J. A., & Lupia, A. (2012). Investigating automated coding of open-ended survey questions. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Orlando, Florida.
- Pasek, J., Sood, G., & Krosnick, J. A. (2012). A certain truth? How Americans received and perceived information about the Obama health care plan. Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Kropko, J., Gross, W., & Krosnick, J. A. (2012). Issue publics and candidate evaluations: Selecting the best fitting models of the moderation of issue agreement by individual issue importance. Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- Pasek, J., Krosnick, J. A., & Tahk, A. M. (2012). Prevalence and moderators of the candidate name order effect: Evidence from all statewide general elections in California. Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.
- MacInnis, B., Krosnick, J. A., Suh, A., & Cho, Mu-Jung. (2013). Assessments of survey accuracy: A multimode national field experiment. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Santa Cruz, H., & Krosnick, J. A. (2013). Shocking misbehavior by face-to-face interviewers: The 2008 ANES office recognition questions. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Vannette, D., Krosnick, J. A. (2013). Mindful responding to questions: The dangers of survey satisficing. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Stark, T. H., Pasek, J., Thompson, T., & Krosnick, J. A. (2013). Measuring anti-Black racism in the U.S. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Kiley, J., Keeter, S., Frei, M., Motel, S., Christian, L.M., Dimock, M., McDonald, M. P., Berent, M., & Krosnick, J. A. (2013). Validating likely voter measures in 2012 pre-election polling. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts.
- MacInnis, B., Howe, L., Krosnick, J. A., Markowitz, E., & Socolow, R. (2013). Confidently uncertain: When expressing uncertainty enhances trust and persuasion. Paper presented at the Society of Experimental Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Berkeley, California.
- Silber, H., Krosnick, J. A., & Yeager, D. (2013). Replication of experimental results across telephone and internet survey panels. Paper presented at the Pacific Chapter of the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California. (Winner of Second Place in the PAPOR Student Paper Competition)
- Holbrook, A. L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2013). A new question sequence to measure voter turnout in telephone surveys: Results of an experiment in the 2006 ANES pilot study. Public Opinion Quarterly Special Issue Conference: Topics in Survey Measurement and Public Opinion. Barbara Jordan Conference Center, Washington, DC.
- Yeager, D., & Krosnick, J. A. (2014). Generalizability as a scientific integrity issue. Paper presented at the Association for Psychological Science Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California.

- Stark, T. H., & Krosnick, J. A. (2014). A new tool for ego-centered networks in online surveys. Paper presented at the European Congress of Methodology, Utrecht, The Netherlands.
- Stark, T. H., Krosnick, J. A., Pasek, J., & Tompson, T. (2014). Comparing measures of anti-Black racial prejudice. Paper presented at the Society for Personality and Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Austin, Texas.
- Stark, T. H., & Krosnick, J. A. (2014). A new tool for ego-centered networks. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Anaheim, California.
- Krosnick, J. A., & MacInnis, B. (2014). Public opinion on global warming: Contradictory results among surveys. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Anaheim, California.
- Silber, H., Krosnick, J. A., Stark, T. H., & Blom, A. G. (2014). Exact replication of question design experiments from Schuman and Presser. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Anaheim, California.
- Krosnick, J. A., Kim, S., & Berman, R. (2014). Testing the principles of optimal questionnaire design: Does a questionnaire supposedly designed better actually work better? Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Anaheim, California.
- Callegaro, M., Lavrakas, P. J., & Krosnick, J. A. The status of online panel research from a data quality perspective. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Anaheim, California.
- Pasek, J., Sood, G., & Krosnick, J. A. (2014). Certain gains in measurement of political knowledge (and misinformation). Paper presented at the International Communication Association Annual Meeting, Seattle, Washington.
- Krosnick, J. A., & MacInnis, B. (2014). How should Congressional representatives decide how to vote? A study of the American public's prescriptions. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association's Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C.
- Krosnick, J. A., & MacInnis, B. (2014). A new method for measuring public opinion in the States and causes of differences: The case of global warming. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association's Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2014). An overview of scientific integrity issues: Worse than you thought. Paper presented at the Society for Experimental Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Columbus, Ohio.
- Yeager, D., & Krosnick, J. A. (2014). An example of (partial) failure to replicate: How important (but not so new) lessons can be (re)learned from relentless pursuit of the ease of retrieval effect. Paper presented at the Society for Experimental Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Columbus, Ohio.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2015). Scientific integrity: The problem is much bigger than we think. Paper presented at the Society for Personality and Social Psychology Annual Meeting, Long Beach, California.
- Stark, T. H., & Krosnick, J. A. (2015). Measuring social networks in large-scale surveys: Challenges and practice of ego-centered and complete network approaches. Paper presented at the European Survey Research Association Annual Meeting, Reykjavik, Iceland.

- Srinivasan, R., Suh, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2015). Comparing direct and filtered frequency questions: Which produces more accurate measurements? Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Hollywood, Florida.
- Clement, S., & Krosnick, J. A. (2015). Does candidate order matter? Impact of matching ballot order on pre-election poll accuracy. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Hollywood, Florida.
- Stark, T. H., & Krosnick, J. A. (2015). A new tool to collect ego-centered network data in online surveys. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Hollywood, Florida.
- Vannette, D. L., & Krosnick, J. A. (2015). The effects and effectiveness of likely voter models in pre-election surveys. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Hollywood, Florida.
- Krosnick, J. A., MacInnis, B., & Villar, A. (2015). Does an introductory sentence in an opinion question cause acquiescence response bias? Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Hollywood, Florida.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2015). Ballot design: The impact of candidate name order. Paper presented at the Electoral Integrity Project Pre-APSA Workshop: What works? Strengthening Electoral Integrity. San Francisco, California.
- Silber, H., Stark, T. H., Blom, A. G. & Krosnick, J. A. (2016). Multi-national replication of experiments on acquiescence from Schuman and Presser. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Austin, Texas.
- Yang, S., Yeager, D. S., Krosnick, J. A., & Anand, S. (2016). Directly testing accepted wisdom regarding the validity of different scale lengths. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Austin, Texas.
- Kim, S., & Krosnick, J. A. (2016). Perceptions about scientific agreement, trust in scientists, and the American public's beliefs about global warming. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Austin, Texas.
- Yang, Y., Callegaro, M., Chin, K., Villar, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2016). Assessing the accuracy of 51 nonprobability online panels and river samples: A study of the Advertising Research Foundation 2013 online panel comparison experiment. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Austin, Texas.
- Silber, H., Stark, T., Blom, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2016). Do response effects generalize across countries? Paper presented at the Second International Conference on Survey Methods in Multinational, Multiregional, and Multicultural Contexts (3MC 2016), sponsored by the International Workshop on Comparative Survey Design and Implementation, Chicago, Illinois.
- Silber, H., Stark, T., Blom, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2016). Multi-national study of questionnaire design. Paper presented at the Second International Conference on Survey Methods in Multinational, Multiregional, and Multicultural Contexts (3MC 2016), sponsored by the International Workshop on Comparative Survey Design and Implementation, Chicago, Illinois.
- MacInnis, B., Anderson, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2016). How do Americans want their elected representatives to make laws? Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

- Kim, S., & Krosnick, J. A. (2016). An exploration of the effect of advertising: The mediating role of perceptions of social proof. Paper presented at the National Communication Association Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- Abeles, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2017). Communicating about climate change: Labels unwittingly signal opinion. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Annual Meeting, San Diego, California.
- Pasek, J., Stark, T., Krosnick, J. A., & Tompson, T. (2017). How would better knowledge influence support for the Affordable Care Act? A simulation and experiment. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Wu, J., Krosnick, J. A., & DeBell, M. (2017). Raking and weighting ANES Time Series. Poster presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Stark, T., Krosnick, J. A., Silber, H., & Blom, A. (2017). A test of generalization of classic question order effects in different cultures. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Lundmark, S., Azevedo, F., Krosnick, J. A., & Marcus, G. E. (2017). Evaluation of the impact of the response slide scales: Validity, cognitive effort, and moderation of experimental treatment effects. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- McLean, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2017). Accuracy of national and state polls in the 2016 election. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Krosnick, J. A., Cho, A., McLean, A., Middleton, C., Kay, D., Abruzzo, J., Munroe, J., & Carrington, M. (2017). Assessing the accuracy of pre-election polls: 2008-2012. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Abeles, A., Howe, L., Krosnick, J. A., & MacInnis, B. (2017). Misperceptions of public opinion: Americans underestimate belief in global warming. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- McLean, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2017). Discrepancies between 2016 pre-election polls and election outcomes: Electoral integrity failure? Paper presented at the pre-APSA workshop entitled "Protecting Electoral Security and Voting Rights: The 2016 U.S. Elections in Comparative Perspective." Sponsored by the Electoral Integrity Project, San Francisco, California.
- McLean, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2017). Fake news preceding the 2016 U.S. Presidential election: Non-scientific "surveys" masquerading as science. Paper presented at the pre-APSA Political Communication Preconference, sponsored by the Political Communication Section of the American Political Science Association, San Francisco, California.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2017). Conference goals. Workshop on Implicit Bias, National Science Foundation, Alexandria, Virginia.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2017). Critiques of implicit bias. Workshop on Implicit Bias, National Science Foundation, Alexandria, Virginia.

- Sekar, S., Krosnick, J. A., & MacInnis, B. (2018). Can we just skip doing surveys altogether? Comparing the accuracy of MRP and LAP to real survey data. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Denver, Colorado.
- Kephart, K., Henderson, A., & Krosnick, J. A. (2018). To list or not to list, that is the question: An examination of existing research on the challenges and best practices of household rostering. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Denver, Colorado.
- Krosnick, J. A., Silber, H., Stark, T., & Blom, A. (2018). Generalization of classic response order effects across cultures. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Denver, Colorado.

Off-Campus Academic Colloquia

- | | |
|------|--|
| 1985 | State University of New York at Stony Brook, Department of Political Science.
Princeton University, Department of Sociology.
Princeton University, Department of Politics.
University of California at Berkeley, Department of Sociology.
Yale University, Department of Sociology.
Yale University, Department of Political Science.
Ohio State University, Department of Psychology.
University of Southern California, Annenberg School for Communication. |
| 1986 | University of Michigan, Department of Sociology. |
| 1987 | Yale University, Department of Psychology.
Yale University, Department of Political Science.
University of Michigan, Department of Sociology. |
| 1988 | University of Minnesota, Department of Political Science. |
| 1990 | University of Florida, Department of Psychology.
University of Florida, Bureau of Economic and Business Research.
Denison University, Department of Psychology. |
| 1991 | University of Michigan, Summer Institute in Survey Research Techniques. |
| 1992 | University of Michigan, Summer Institute in Survey Research Techniques.
University of Michigan, Department of Communication. |
| 1993 | University of Wisconsin, Departments of Psychology, Sociology, and Political Science.
University of Michigan, Summer Institute in Survey Research Techniques. |
| 1994 | Yale University, Department of Psychology.
University of Michigan, Research Center for Group Dynamics.
Cornell University, Peace Studies Center. |
| 1995 | University of Michigan, Summer Institute in Survey Research Techniques.
University of Minnesota, Department of Political Science. |
| 1996 | University of Pennsylvania, Annenberg School for Communication.
University of Chicago, Center for Decision Research.
Purdue University, Department of Psychology. |

- 1997 Stanford University, Department of Psychology.
University of California – Berkeley, Institute of Governmental Studies.
University of California – Berkeley, Institute of Personality and Social Research.
University of California – Irvine, Department of Social Sciences.
University of California – Los Angeles, Institute for Social Science Research.
University of California – Santa Barbara, Department of Psychology.
University of California – Santa Cruz, Board of Psychology.
Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences.
London School of Economics and Political Science, Methodology Institute.
- 1998 Arizona State University, Department of Psychology.
London School of Economics and Political Science, Methodology Institute.
University of Amsterdam, Department of Psychology.
Carnegie Mellon University, Center for the Integrated Study of the Human Dimensions of Global Change, Department of Engineering and Public Policy.
- 1999 University of Chicago, American Politics Workshop, Department of Political Science.
Indiana University, Departments of Political Science and Psychology.
University of Minnesota, Departments of Political Science and Psychology.
- 2000 University of California, Los Angeles, Department of Political Science.
University of Southern California, Jesse M. Unruh Institute of Politics.
University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research, Survey Research Center.
- 2001 The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, Menlo Park, California.
London School of Economics and Political Science, Methodology Institute.
Resources for the Future, Washington, DC.
- 2002 University of Colorado - Boulder, Department of Psychology.
University of Florida - Gainesville, Department of Psychology.
Stanford University, Department of Communication.
University of Chicago, Harris School of Public Policy.
Uppsala University (Sweden), Department of Government.
University of North Carolina, Department of Political Science.
University of Chicago, Political Psychology Workshop, Departments of Psychology and Political Science.
Pitzer College, Department of Political Science.
- 2003 University of Illinois at Chicago, College of Urban Planning and Public Affairs.
University of Illinois at Chicago, Survey Research Laboratory.
Stanford University, Social Psychology Research Seminar (April).
Stanford University, Social Psychology Research Seminar (October).
Stanford University, Department of Psychology Colloquium Series.
- 2004 Harvard University, Research Workshop in American Politics, Department of Government.
Stanford University, Organizational Behavior Seminar, Graduate School of Business.
Stanford University, Marketing Seminar, Graduate School of Business.
Stanford University, American Empirical Seminar, Stanford Institute for the Quantitative Study of Society.
University of California, Davis, Distinguished Lecture Series, Departments of Psychology and Political Science.
- 2005 The Rand Organization, Santa Monica, California.

- 2006 Harvard University, Department of Psychology.
Duke University, Social Science Research Institute.
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, Department of Political Science.
University of Florida, Department of Psychology.
University of Florida, Department of Political Science.
University of California, Santa Barbara, Department of Psychology.
- 2007 The Rand Organization, Santa Monica, California.
The University of Essex (UK), Department of Government.
The University of Essex (UK), Institute for Social and Economic Research.
- 2008 University of Minnesota, Department of Political Science.
University of California - Berkeley, Department of Political Science – Institute of Governmental Studies.
Northwestern University, School of Communication.
University of California - Berkeley, Institute for Personality and Social Research.
- 2015 Center for Population Research, University of California - Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California.
Institute for Science, Technology, and Public Policy, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas.
Annette Strauss Institute for Civic Participation, Department of Communication Studies, University of Texas – Austin, Austin, Texas.
Department of Political and Social Sciences, Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, Spain.
Department of Psychology, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.
Department of Psychology, University of California, San Diego.
- 2016 Behavioral Science Workshop, Booth School of Business, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.
Social Psychology Colloquium, Department of Psychology, New York University, New York, New York.
- 2017 Colloquium Series, Department of Psychology, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona.
Colloquium Series, School of Politics and Global Studies, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona.
- 2012 Political Psychology Colloquium Series, Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, California.
Department of Geosciences and Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton, University.
Department of Psychology, University of Mannheim, Mannheim, Germany.

On-campus Colloquia

- 1986 Department of Political Science, Ohio State University.
Department of Psychology, Ohio State University.
- 1987 Department of Psychology, Ohio State University.
- 1988 Department of Psychology, Ohio State University.
- 1990 Department of Psychology, Ohio State University.

- 1991 Mershon Center World Affairs Seminar, Mershon Center, Ohio State University.
- 1996 Behavioral Decision Theory Colloquium Series, Department of Psychology, Ohio State University.
CIC Interactive Video Methods Seminar, Department of Political Science, Ohio State University.
- 1997 Interdisciplinary Seminar on Survey Research Methods, Center for Human Resource Research, Ohio State University.
- 1999 Department of Agricultural, Environmental, and Development Economics, Ohio State University.
- 2000 Center for Survey Research, Ohio State University.
- 2002 Social Psychology Colloquium Series, Department of Psychology, Ohio State University.
Department of Agricultural, Environmental, and Development Economics, Ohio State University.
- 2003 Mershon Center Lunch Lecture, The Mershon Center, Ohio State University.
- 2004 Global Climate and Energy Project Fall Seminar Series, Stanford University.
John S. Knight Fellowship Program Seminar, Stanford University.
- 2005 Workshop in Statistical Modeling, Department of Political Science, Stanford University.
Environmental Policy Forum, Center for Environmental Science and Policy, Stanford University.
Humanities and Sciences Forum, Stanford University.
Seminar Series, Summer Research College in Public Policy and Economics, Stanford University.
- 2006 Seminar Series, Summer Research College in Public Policy and Economics, Stanford University.
Woods Energy Series, Woods Institute for the Environment, Stanford University.
- 2007 Ethics @ Noon, Barbara and Bowen McCoy Program in Ethics in Society Lecture Series, Stanford University.
Seminar Series, Summer Research College in Public Policy and Economics, Stanford University.
Opening Plenary, Society of Environmental Journalists Annual Conference, Stanford University.
- 2008 How America Votes: Stanford Professors Answer the Fundamental Questions Raised When U.S Citizens Vote. Workshop sponsored by Stanford in Government.
Transformational Insights: Participation, Collaboration, and Virtual Worlds for Sustainability, Medicine, and Education. Sixth Media X Annual Meeting, Stanford University.
Social Psychology Research Seminar, Stanford University.
Lunch Colloquium Series, Public Policy Program, Stanford University.
Seminar Series, Summer Research College in Public Policy and Economics, Stanford University.
Stanford Parents' Advisory Board Meeting, Stanford University.

- 2009 Environmental Forum, Woods Institute for the Environment, Stanford University.
Woods Institute and School of Earth Sciences Summer Seminar Series, Stanford University.
- 2010 Research Seminar Series, Center for International Security and Cooperation, Stanford University (discussant).
Faculty Speaker Series, Stanford High School Summer College, Stanford University.
Seminar Series, Summer Research College in Public Policy and Economics, Stanford University.
The Prison Lunch Series, Stanford Law and Policy Review, Stanford Law School.
Social Psychology Research Seminar, Stanford University.
- 2011 Address to the Advisory Council of the Woods Institute for the Environment, Stanford University.
Address to the Advisory Council of the Precourt Institute for Energy, Stanford University.
Seminar Series, Summer Research College in Public Policy and Economics, Stanford University.
Summer Short Course on Marine Policy, Center for Ocean Solutions, Stanford University.
Energy @ Stanford & SLAC, Stanford Graduate Summer Institute, Stanford University.
Engaging with Faculty: Stories from Undergraduate Research and Learning Beyond the Classroom, New Student Orientation, Stanford University.
Energy Seminar sponsored by the Woods Institute for the Environment and the Precourt Institute for Energy, Stanford University.
Invited Presentation, Summer Research College Speaker Series, Public Policy Program, Stanford University, Stanford, California.
- 2012 Member of a Faculty Discussion Panel during the Joint Young Environmental Scholars Conference sponsored by the Woods Institute for the Environment and the Environmental Norms Workshop sponsored by the Stanford Humanities Center, Stanford University.
Invited Lecture, "Peering Inside the Mind of the American Voter: The Psychology of Democracy in Action." Back to School Class, 2012 Parents' Weekend, Stanford University. <http://parentsweekend.stanford.edu/overview/biography-mackey>
Invited Presentation, "A Program of Research on Americans' Thinking about Climate Change." Woods Institute for the Environment Community Retreat, Aptos, California.
Invited Presentation, "American Public Opinion on Climate Change." School of Earth Sciences Undergraduate Research Program Seminar Series (cosponsored by SURGE and the Woods Institute for the Environment). Stanford University.
Invited Presentation, Engaging with Faculty: Stories from Undergraduate Research and Learning Beyond the Classroom, New Student Orientation, Stanford University.
Invited Presentation, "Are Elections in America Unfair? Exploring the Impact of Candidate Name Order." Stanford Parents Association, Stanford University.
Panel Member, "Election 2012: Reality Check. A Bloomberg News Post-Presidential-Debate Debate." Sponsored by the Stanford Graduate Program in Journalism and the Stanford Graduate School of Business Politics and Government Club.
Invited Presentation, Summer Research College Speaker Series, Public Policy Program, Stanford University, Stanford, California.
- 2013 Invited Presentation, "The Psychology of American Elections: Getting Into the Heads of Voters", Yost House After-Dinner Presentation.

- Invited Presentation, Engaging with Faculty: Stories from Undergraduate Research and Learning Beyond the Classroom, New Student Orientation, Stanford University.
- Invited Presentation, Summer Research College Speaker Series, Public Policy Program, Stanford University, Stanford, California.
- 2014
- Invited Presentation, “Is it Americans’ Fault that the U.S. Government Has Yet to Seriously Limit Greenhouse Gas Emissions?” School of Earth Sciences Undergraduate Research Program Seminar Series (cosponsored by SURGE and SESUR and the Woods Institute for the Environment). Stanford University.
- Invited Presentation, “Why Elections Go Wrong: The Impact of the Order of Candidates’ Names on the Ballot.” Fred Hillier Lecture Series, English for Foreign Students Program, Stanford University.
- Invited Presentation, Engaging with Faculty: Stories from Undergraduate Research and Learning Beyond the Classroom, New Student Orientation, Stanford University.
- Invited Panel Member, Sustainable World Coalition’s Planet Earth New Play Festival, Stanford University.
- Invited Panel Member, “The Climate Debate Demystified: The Psychology, Media, and Communication Behavior Climate Change.” Sponsored by Students for a Sustainable Stanford, Stanford University.
- Invited Presentation, Summer Research College Speaker Series, Public Policy Program, Stanford University.
- Invited Panelist, “Climate Change: From Science to Action.” Classes without Quizzes, Stanford University.
- 2015
- Invited Presentation, Engaging with Faculty: Stories from Undergraduate Research and Learning Beyond the Classroom, New Student Orientation, Stanford University.
- Invited Presentation, Summer Research College Speaker Series, Political Science Department, Stanford University.
- 2016
- Energy Seminar sponsored by the Woods Institute for the Environment and the Precourt Institute for Energy, Stanford University.
- Invited Presentation, Summer Research College Speaker Series, Political Science Department, Stanford University.
- Invited Presentation, Engaging with Faculty: Stories from Undergraduate Research and Learning Beyond the Classroom, New Student Orientation, Stanford University.
- Invited Presentation, Psychology of the 2016 Election. Stanford in Government Policy Lunch.
- Invited Presentation, “The 2016 Election.” Epidemiology Supper Club, Stanford University Medical School, Stanford, CA.
- 2017
- Invited Presentation, “Public Opinion on Climate Change”, SUPER Faculty Seminar Lunches, Precourt Institute for Energy, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.
- Invited Presentation, Summer Research College Speaker Series, Public Policy Program, Stanford University, Stanford, California.
- Invited Presentation, Summer Research College Methodology Speaker Series, Political Science Department, Stanford University, Stanford, California.
- Invited Presentation, “Why Elections Go Wrong: The Impact of the Order of Candidates’ Names on the Ballot.” Fred Hillier Lecture Series, English for Foreign Students Program, Stanford University.
- Invited Presentation, Engaging with Faculty: Stories from Undergraduate Research and Learning Beyond the Classroom, New Student Orientation, Stanford University.
- Presentation, Communication Department Faculty Retreat, Stanford University.

- 2018 Invited Presentation, “The Accuracy of the 2016 Pre-Election Polls.” Seminar Series of the John S. Knight Journalism Fellowship Program, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.
 Invited Presentation, “The Impact of Candidate Name Order on Election Outcomes.”
 Neurosciences Journal Club and Professional Development Court, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.

Other Presentations

- 2012 Coauthor of presentation by Elisabeth Brügger (Maastricht University). “Establishing the Accuracy of Online Panel Research”, Waikato Management School, University Of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand.
- 2018 Coauthor of presentation by Elisabeth Brügger (Maastricht University). “Establishing the Accuracy of Online Panel Research”, Department of Marketing, Faculty of Business and Economics, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia.
- 2019 Coauthor of presentation by Elisabeth Brügger (Maastricht University). “Establishing the Accuracy of Online Panel Research”, Department of Management and Marketing, Faculty of Business and Economics, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia.
- 2020 Coauthor of presentation by Elisabeth Brügger (Maastricht University). “Establishing the Accuracy of Online Panel Research”, Center for the Study of Choice (CenSoC), University of Technology, Sydney, Australia.
- 2012 Coauthor of presentation by Elisabeth Brügger (Maastricht University). “Establishing the Accuracy of Online Panel Research”, School of Marketing, Australian School of Business, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia

Conferences Coordinated

- 1991 Conference Coordinator, Annual Meeting, Society of Experimental Social Psychology, Columbus, Ohio.
- 1991 Conference Coordinator, “Nags Head Conference on Attitude Strength,” Nags Head, North Carolina.
- 1998 Program Coordinator, Annual Meeting, International Society for Political Psychology, Montreal, Canada.
- 2002-2004 Conference Chair, Annual Meeting, American Association for Public Opinion Research, Nashville, Tennessee.
- 2005 Conference Co-Coordinator, “New Approaches to Understanding Participation in Surveys”, Belmont Conference Center, Elkridge, Maryland.
- 2007 Conference Co-Coordinator, “Cyberinfrastructure and National Election Studies: The Wivenhoe House Conference”. University of Essex, Colchester, UK.
- 2007 Conference Co-Coordinator, “News Media Pollster Input to the American National Election Studies”. Gallup World Headquarters, Washington, DC.

- 2008 Conference Co-Coordinator, “Optimal Coding of Open-Ended Survey Data, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- 2013 Conference Co-Coordinator, “The Future of Survey Research 1”, National Science Foundation, Arlington, Virginia.
- 2013 Conference Co-Coordinator, “The Future of Survey Research 2”, National Science Foundation, Arlington, Virginia.
- 2014 Conference Co-Coordinator, “Robust Research in the Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences”, National Science Foundation, Arlington, Virginia.
- 2015 Conference Co-Coordinator, “Best Practices in Science”, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford University, Stanford, California.
- 2015 Conference Co-Coordinator, “How Voters Think: Lessons from Science and Practice.” A meeting of political scientists with Democratic Party campaign consultants. Harris School of Public Policy, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.
- 2015 Conference Co-Coordinator, “How Voters Think: Lessons from Science and Practice.” A meeting of political scientists with Republican Party campaign consultants. Harris School of Public Policy, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.
- 2017 Conference Coordinator, “Workshop on Implicit Bias.” National Science Foundation, Alexandria, Virginia.

Professional Service

- 1989-1990 Chair, Student Paper Competition Committee, American Association for Public Opinion Research.
- 1990 Member, Planning Committee for the 1990 National Election Study.
- 1990 Member, Conference Committee for the 1991 Annual Meeting, American Association for Public Opinion Research.
- 1991 Participant in an Expert Questionnaire Evaluation Panel as a part of a Project Comparing Pre-Testing Methods, National Center for Health Statistics.
- 1994 Member, Student Paper Competition Committee, American Association for Public Opinion Research.
- 1995 Member, National Science Foundation Special Grant Proposal Evaluation Panel on Valuation for Environmental Policy.
- 1996 Member, Student Paper Competition Committee, American Association for Public Opinion Research.
- 1996 Member, Planning Committee for the 1996 National Election Study.
- 1997-2001
2003, 2004 Member, Conference Committee, American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting.

1998	Member, Planning Committee for the 1998 National Election Pilot Study.
1999	Senior Research Advisor, The Gallup Organization.
1997-2006	Member, Board of Overseers, National Election Studies, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
2000-2003	Member, Governing Council, International Society of Political Psychology.
2000-2003	Member, Conference Committee, International Society of Political Psychology.
2000-2002	Member, Survey Methodology Group of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth.
2000-2008	Member, Board of Overseers, General Social Survey, National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago.
2001	Member, Advisory Board of the Canadian Election Study, McGill University, University of Montreal, and University of Toronto.
2001-2003	Associate Conference Chair, American Association for Public Opinion Research.
2001-2003	Chair, Committee to Award the Erik H. Erikson Early Career Award for Excellence and Creativity in the Field of Political Psychology, International Society of Political Psychology.
2001	Member, Visiting Committee to Evaluate a Proposed Ph.D. Program in Survey Research and Methodology, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska.
2002	Member, Advisory Panel, Special Competition to Fund Research on Survey and Statistical Methodology; Methodology, Measurement, and Statistics Program, National Science Foundation.
2003	Member, Advisory Board of the Canadian Election Study, McGill University, University of Montreal, and University of Toronto.
2004-2006	Member, Advisory Committee for the Division of Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences, National Science Foundation.
2004-2006	Member, Scientific Advisory Board, Polimetrix, Palo Alto, California.
2004	Member, Workshop on Cyberinfrastructure and the Social Sciences, National Science Foundation.
2005	Organizing committee, Conference entitled "New Approaches to Understanding Participation in Surveys," Belmont Conference Center, Elkridge, Maryland, sponsored by the National Science Foundation.
2005	Member, Philip E. Converse Book Award Committee, American Political Science Association.
2005	Member, Nominating committee, International Society for Political Psychology.

2005	Member, Working Group on Public Attitudes and Ethical Issues, Global Roundtable on Climate Change, Earth Institute, Columbia University.
2006	Dissertation committee member, William M. van der Veld, Faculty of Social and Behavioral Sciences, University of Amsterdam.
2007	Participant, “Public Understanding of Mathematics/Mathematicians Understanding the Public” Conference, Mathematical Sciences Education Board, The National Academies, Washington, D.C.
2007	Associated Scientist, Statistics and Methodology Department, National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.
2007	Participant, “Workshop on Planning for the Future of the General Social Survey,” National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.
2007-	Member, Advisory Board, Book Series on Political Psychology, Oxford University Press.
2007-	Member, International Advisory Board, Measurement and Experiments in the Social Sciences, Institute for Data Collection and Research, University of Tilburg, The Netherlands.
2008	Participant, “Meeting to Assess Public Attitudes about Climate Change,” sponsored by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NASA, and the Center for Excellence in Climate Change Communication Research, Silver Spring, Maryland.
2008	Participant, The Harvard Globalization Survey Workshop, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
2008-2012	Member, Board of Directors, Climate Central, Princeton, New Jersey, and Palo Alto, California.
2010	Panel Participant, Career Day, Menlo School, Menlo Park, California.
2009-2010	Member, AAPOR Opt-in Panel Online Panel Task Force.
2016	Chair, Committee to Conduct a Site Visit Review of the General Social Survey for the National Science Foundation.
2011-2016	Member, Advisory Committee for the Division of Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences, National Science Foundation.
2012	Member, Policy Impact Award Committee, American Association for Public Opinion Research.
2012	Member, Advisory Committee on Study to Evaluate the Impact of Survey Response Rates, Pew Researcher Center, Washington, DC.
2012-	Member, Advisory Board, Voice of the People.
2012	Chair, Subcommittee on the Future of Survey Research, Advisory Committee for the Division of Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences, National Science Foundation.
2013-2016	Member, Governing Council, International Society of Political Psychology.

2012-2015	Member, Subcommittee on Replication in Social, Behavioral, and Economic Science Research, Advisory Committee for the Division of Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences, National Science Foundation.
2014-	Member, International Advisory Board, Norwegian Citizen Panel, Digital Social Science Core Faculty, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway.
2015-2016	Member, Standing Committee on the Future of NSF-Supported Social Science Surveys, Committee on National Statistics, Division of Behavioral and Social Science and Education, The National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine.
2016	Chair, Committee to Award the Noel Markwell Media Award, International Society of Political Psychology.
2016-2017	Member, Committee to Award the AAPOR Mitofsky Innovators Award, American Association for Public Opinion Research.
2016-2017	Member, Subcommittee on Workplace Climate and Harassment, Working Group on Diversity, National Institutes of Health.
2017	Member, Committee on AAPOR Standard and Litigation Surveys. American Association for Public Opinion Research.
2018	Co-convener, CPS Forum on Measuring Voter Turnout, Summer at Census, U.S. Census Bureau, Suitland, Maryland.

Department and University Service

1985-1996 2001-2003	Faculty Advisor, Social Psychology Colloquium Series, Ohio State University.
1985-1990	Chair, Social Psychology Area Admissions Committee, Ohio State University.
1985-1990	Member, Psychology Department Admissions Committee, Ohio State University.
1986-1987	Member, Psychology Department Stipends Committee, Ohio State University.
1986-1988	Member, Lazenby Equipment Committee, Ohio State University.
1986-1987	Member, Social Psychology Area Search Committee for Two Permanent Senior Faculty Members, Ohio State University.
1988-1989	Member, Social Psychology Area Search Committee for Junior Faculty Member, Ohio State University.
1990-1991	Member, Search Committee for Junior Faculty Member in Industrial/Organizational Psychology, Ohio State University.
1989-1994	Co-Coordinator, Political Psychology Minor Program Steering Committee, Political Science Department, Ohio State University.

1989-1996, 1999-2003	Member, Psychology Department Speakers Committee, Ohio State University.
1990-1996	Member, Psychology Department Subject Pool Supervisory Committee, Ohio State University.
1995-1997	Chair, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences Survey Research Advisory Committee, Ohio State University.
1995-1997	Member, Political Science Department Search Committee, Ohio State University.
1997-2003	Member, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences Center for Survey Research Advisory Committee, Ohio State University.
2000	Chair, Social Psychology Senior Faculty Search Committee, Ohio State University.
2000	Member, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences Oversight Committee for the Center for Human Resource Research, Ohio State University.
2001-2003	Member, Psychology Department Promotion and Tenure Committee, Ohio State University.
2001-2003	Chair, Social Psychology Junior Faculty Search Committee, Ohio State University.
2002	Faculty advisor, Summer Research Opportunity Program, Committee on Instructional Cooperation (CIC), Ohio State University.
2003-2005	Member, Planning Committee for the Social Science Research Institute, Stanford University.
2003-2004	Member, Steering Committee for the Methods of Analysis Program in the Social Sciences, Stanford University.
2004-	Faculty Affiliate, Center for Comparative Studies in Race and Ethnicity, Stanford University.
2004	Grant proposal review committee, Environmental Interdisciplinary Initiatives Program, Stanford Institute for the Environment, Stanford University.
2004-2005	Planning Committee for the Stanford Center on Longevity, Stanford University.
2005-2008	Member, Faculty Leadership Committee, Stanford Institute for the Environment, Stanford University.
2006	Grant proposal review committee, Environmental Venture Grants Program, Woods Institute for the Environment, Stanford University.
2007	Co-chair, Grant proposal review committee, Environmental Venture Grants Program, Woods Institute for the Environment, Stanford University.
2012-	Member, Grant proposal review committee, Environmental Venture Grants Program, Woods Institute for the Environment, Stanford University.
2012-2016	Member, Course Evaluation Committee, Stanford University.
2012-2013	Member, Provost's Advisory Committee on Postdoctoral Affairs, Stanford University.

- | | |
|------|--|
| 2012 | Member, Evaluation committee for applicants to the Emmett Interdisciplinary Program in Environment & Resources, Stanford University. |
| 2013 | Member, Evaluation committee for applicants to the Emmett Interdisciplinary Program in Environment & Resources, Stanford University. |
| 2014 | Member, Evaluation committee for applicants to the Emmett Interdisciplinary Program in Environment & Resources, Stanford University. |

Ad Hoc Reviewer

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology
 Journal of Experimental Social Psychology
 Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin
 Social Psychology Quarterly
 European Journal of Social Psychology
 Social Cognition
 Basic and Applied Social Psychology
 Journal of Personality
 Psychological Review
 Psychological Bulletin
 Psychological Science
 Psychological Assessment
 Personality and Social Psychology Review
 Psychology and Aging
 Risk Analysis
 Psychology, Public Policy, and Law
 American Political Science Review
 American Journal of Political Science
 American Politics Quarterly
 Western Political Quarterly
 Political Research Quarterly
 Political Behavior
 Research and Politics
 Journal of Politics
 Political Analysis
 Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics
 Southeastern Political Review
 Public Opinion Quarterly
 International Journal of Public Opinion Research
 Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology
 Political Psychology
 Political Communication
 International Studies Quarterly
 American Sociological Review
 Sociological Methods and Research
 Sociological Methodology
 Social Science Quarterly
 Social Problems
 Journal of Official Statistics
 Journal of the American Statistical Association
 Journal of Economic Psychology
 Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization

Communication Research
 Journal of Consumer Research
 Journal of Science Communication
 Journal of Research in Personality
 Developmental Psychology
 Motivation and Emotion
 Psychophysiology
 Climatic Change
 Climate Change Letters
 Review of Policy Research
 Annals of Epidemiology
 Communication Methods and Measures
 Preventive Medicine
 New Jersey Medicine
 Journal of Medical Internet Research
 Academic Press
 Praeger Publishers
 Alfred A. Knopf Publishers
 Brooks/Cole Publishing Company
 Harper and Row Publishers
 MacMillan Publishing Company
 Cambridge University Press
 Oxford University Press
 W. W. Norton
 W. H. Freeman
 National Academy of Sciences
 National Science Foundation - Social Psychology Program
 National Science Foundation - Sociology Program
 National Science Foundation - Political Science Program
 National Science Foundation - Program in Methodology, Measurement, and Statistics in the Social Sciences
 Society for Consumer Psychology
 American Psychological Association
 Time-sharing Experiments for the Social Sciences (TESS)
 University of Michigan, Department of Political Science (P&T)
 University of Minnesota, Department of Political Science (P&T)
 University of Minnesota, Department of Psychology (P&T)
 University of Southern California, Department of Psychology (P&T)
 University of Texas – Austin, Department of Communication Studies (P&T)
 London School of Economics and Political Science, Methodology Institute (P&T)
 University of Nebraska, Department of Political Science (P&T)
 University of Nebraska, Department of Psychology (P&T)
 Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Department of Political Science (P&T)
 University of Chicago, Harris School of Public Policy (P&T)
 University of Chicago, Department of Political Science (P&T)
 Iowa State University, Department of Psychology (P&T)
 Ohio State University, University Libraries (P&T)
 University of Florida, Department of Psychology (P&T)
 University of Pennsylvania, Department of Political Science (P&T)
 Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan (P&T)
 Columbia University, Department of Political Science (P&T)
 American University, School of Public Affairs (P&T)
 Center for Advanced Study in the Social and Behavioral Sciences
 University of Mannheim, School of Social Sciences, Department of Political Science (P&T)
 Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities and Social Sciences

Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research, Division of Social Sciences
Workers' Compensation Board of British Columbia
Fund for Scientific Research – Flanders, Brussels, Belgium

Consulting and Court Testimony

Office of Science and Technology Policy, The White House, Washington D.C.
Socio-Environmental Studies Laboratory, National Institutes of Health, Washington, D.C.
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Washington, D.C.
Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.
National Aeronautics and Space Administration (Robert Dodd and Associates/The Battelle Memorial Institute),
Mountain View, California.
Center for Survey Methods Research, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.
Office of Survey Methods Research, U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, D.C.
Leadership Analysis Group, U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, McLean, Virginia.
United States Government Accountability Office, Washington, DC.
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, Georgia.
National Cancer Institute, Rockville, Maryland.
Centre for Comparative Social Surveys, City University, London, United Kingdom.
Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, California.
SRI International, Arlington, Virginia.
YouGov, London, United Kingdom.
Momentum Market Intelligence, Portland, Oregon.
Central Market Research and Insights, Microsoft, Redmond, Washington.
The Urban Institute, Washington, D.C.
Industrial Economics, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
Healthcare Research Systems, Columbus, Ohio.
Survey Research Center, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland.
Center for Human Resource Research, Columbus, Ohio.
Washington State University, Pullman, Washington.
Stanford University Alumni Association, Stanford, California.
Turner Research, Jacksonville, Florida.
NuStats, Austin, Texas.
Kaiser Family Foundation, Menlo Park, California.
University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
Achievement Associates, Darnestown, Maryland.
The Saguaro Seminar: Civic Engagement in America, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
Office of Social Research, CBS Inc., New York, New York.
ABC News, New York, New York.
Home Box Office, New York, New York.
Google, Mountain View, California.
Pfizer, Inc., New York, New York.
Amgen, Thousand Oaks, California.
Beau Townsend Ford Dealership, Dayton, Ohio.
United States Trotting Association, Columbus, Ohio.
Berlex Laboratories, Inc., Wayne, New Jersey.
MJ Research, Waltham, Massachusetts.
Empire Blue Cross/Blue Shield, New York, New York.
Nike, Inc., Portland, Oregon.
U.S. Senator Brian Schatz (Hawaii)
The Attorney General of Oklahoma.
Office of Lake County Prosecuting Attorney, Painesville, Ohio.
The Attorney General of the State of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio.

Donald McTigue, Esq., Columbus, Ohio.
 Thompson Coburn LLP, St. Louis, Missouri.
 Shook, Hardy, & Bacon LLP, Kansas City, Missouri.
 Arnold and Porter LLP, New York, New York.
 Bradley W. Hertz, Esq., Los Angeles, California.
 Larson King LLP, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
 Paul, Hastings, Janofsky, and Walker, LLP, San Francisco, California.
 Carr, Korein, Tillery, LLP, Chicago, Illinois.
 Milberg, Weiss, Bershad, Hynes, and Lerach, LLP, New York, New York.
 ourgault & Harding, Las Vegas, Nevada.
 Aikin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld, LLP, Washington, DC.
 McManemin and Smith, PC, Dallas, Texas.
 Zimmerman Reed, PLLP, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
 Spolin Silverman, Cohen, and Bertlett LLP, Santa Monica, California.
 Righetti Wynne P.C., San Francisco, California.
 Blackwell Sanders Peper Martin LLP, Kansas City, Missouri.
 Davis Wright Tremaine LLP, Seattle, Washington.
 Storch Amini & Munves, P.C., New York, New York.
 Marc O. Stern, APC, La Jolla, California.
 Morris, Sullivan, & Lemkul, LLP, San Diego, California.
 Twomey Law Office, Epsom, New Hampshire.
 KamberLaw LLC, New York, New York.
 Righetti Law Firm, P.C., San Francisco, California.
 Dostart Clapp Gordon & Coveney LLP, San Diego, California.
 Wynne Law Firm, Greenbrae, California.
 Lorens and Associates, San Diego, California.
 Arias, Ozzello & Gignac, LLP, Los Angeles, California.
 Righetti Glugoski, P.C., San Francisco, California.
 Kaplan Fox, & Kilsheimer LLP, San Francisco, California.
 Perkins Coie, LLP, Washington, DC.
 Levi & Korsinsky LLP, Stamford, Connecticut.
 King, Blackwell, Zehnder, & Wermuth, P. A., Orlando, Flor
 Keller Grover, LLP, San Francisco, California.
 Law Offices of Kevin T. Barnes, Los Angeles, California.
 Cohelan & Khoury, San Diego, California.
 Rastegar & Matern, Torrance, California.
 Law Offices of Joseph Antonelli, West Covina, California.
 Minter Ellison Lawyers, Sydney, Australia.
 Silverman Thompson Slutkin White LLC, Baltimore, Maryland.
 Namanny Byrne, & Owens, P.C. Lake Forest, California
 Robbins, Geller, Rudman, & Dowd, LLP, Boca Raton, Florida.
 Callahan and Blaine, Santa Ana, California.
 Richardson, Patrick, Westbrook, and Brickman, Mount Pleasant, South Carolina.
 Hurst and Hurst, San Diego, California.
 Leonard Carder, San Francisco, California.
 Initiative Legal Group, Los Angeles, California.
 Khorramu Pollard & Abir, Los Angeles, California.
 Rukin, Hyland, Doria, and Tindall, San Francisco, California.
 Carlson, Calladine, & Peterson, San Francisco, California.
 Munger, Tolles, & Olson, Los Angeles, California.
 American Civil Liberties Union of Northern California/Brad Seligman/Howard, Rice, Nemerovski, Canady,
 Falk, & Rabkin, San Francisco/Berkeley, California.
 Foley & Lardner LLP, San Francisco, California.
 Law Offices of Sima Fard, Irvine, California.

Rifkin, Livingston, Levitan, & Silver, Annapolis, Maryland.
 Altshuler Berzon LLP, San Francisco, California.
 Law Offices of Hathaway, Perrett, Webster, Powers, Chrisman, & Gutierrez, Ventura, California.
 R. Rex Parris Law Firm, Lancaster, California.
 McCune Wright, LLP, Redlands, California.
 Gustafson Gluek PLLC, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
 Saltz, Mongeluzzi, Barrett, & Bendesky, P.C. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
 Reinhardt, Wendorf, & Blanchfield, St. Paul, Minnesota.
 Wexler Wallace LLP, Chicago, Illinois.
 Cotchett, Pitre, & McCarthy, Burlingame, California.
 Berman De Valerio, San Francisco, California.
 Marlin & Saltzman, Agoura Hills, California
 Lawyers for Justics, Glendale, California.
 Klafter, Olsen, & Lesser LLP, Rye Brook, New York.
 Shavitz Law Group, P.A., Boca Raton, Florida.
 Capstone Law APC, Los Angeles, California.
 Law Offices of Ronald A. Marron, San Diego, California.
 Del Mar Law Group, San Diego, California.
 Stonebarger Law, Folsom, California.
 Cahill Gordon & Reindel, New York, New York.
 Hogue & Belong, San Diego, California.
 Morris Sullivan Lemkul, San Diego, California.
 Traber & Voorhees, Pasadena, California.
 Workman Law Firm, San Francisco, California.
 Kingsley & Kingsley, Encino, California.
 Sheno Koes, Pasadena, California.
 KamberLaw, Denver, Colorado.

Short Courses on Questionnaire Design

Internal Revenue Service, Washington, DC.
 United States General Accounting Office, Washington, DC.
 Office of Management and Budget, The White House, Washington, DC.
 United States Government Accountability Office, Washington, DC.
 United States Federal Trade Commission, Washington, DC.
 United State Census Bureau, Suitland, Maryland.
 Science Resources Statistics Program, National Science Foundation, Washington, DC.
 National Opinion Research Center, Chicago, Illinois.
 Survey Research Laboratory, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.
 Center for AIDS Prevention Studies, Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University of California,
 San Francisco, California.
 Monitor Company, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
 American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, St. Louis, Missouri.
 American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Portland, Oregon
 American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Meeting, Miami, Florida
 New York Chapter of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, New York, New York.
 Office for National Statistics, London, United Kingdom.
 Market Strategies, Southfield, Michigan.
 Total Research Corporation, Princeton, New Jersey.
 Pfizer, Inc., New York, New York.
 Worldwide Market Intelligence Conference, IBM, Rye, New York.
 American Society of Trial Consultants Annual Meeting, Williamsburg, Virginia.

American Society of Trial Consultants Annual Meeting, Westminster, Colorado.
 American Society of Trial Consultants Annual Meeting, Memphis, Tennessee.
 American Marketing Association Advanced Research Techniques Forum, Vail, Colorado.
 Satisfaction Research Division, IBM, White Plains, New York.
 American Marketing Association Marketing Effectiveness Online Seminar Series.
 Faculty of Education, University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg, South Africa.
 Odom Institute, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina (2005 and 2009)
 Google, Mountain View, California.
 Eric M. Mindich Encounters with Authors, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
 RTI International, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina.
 BC Stats, Province of British Columbia Ministry of Labour and Citizens' Services, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada.
 Alphadetail, San Mateo, California.
 Amgen, Thousand Oaks, California.
 Center for Political Studies, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
 San Jose State University, San Jose, California.
 Summer School 2008, Australian Market and Social Research Society, Coffs Harbour, New South Wales, Australia.
 Professional Development Program, Australian Market and Social Research Society, Sydney, Australia (2008 and 2009).
 Professional Development Program, Australian Market and Social Research Society, Melbourne, Australia.
 Professional Development Program Webinar, Australian Market and Social Research Society (2012).
 Zentrum für Umfragen, Methoden und Analysen (ZUMA), Mannheim, Germany.
 Department of Marketing, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, Illinois.
 Comparative Survey Research and Methodology Workshop, sponsored by TNS Opinion and the Centre for the Study of Political Change at the University of Siena, Brussels, Belgium (2010 and 2011).
 Department of Survey Design and Methodology, GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences, Mannheim, Germany.
 Methodology Institute, London School of Economics and Political Science, London, United Kingdom.
 Summer School 2013, Australian Market and Social Research Society, Gold Coast, Australia.
 Social Science Research Laboratories, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatchewan, Canada (2015).

University Teaching

Summer Institute in Political Psychology (Instructor and Co-Director), Political Science and Psychology 892A, 892B, Ohio State University.
 Research Methods in Social Psychology, Psychology 872, Ohio State University.
 Systematic Theory in Social Psychology, Psychology 873C, Ohio State University.
 Psychological Perspectives on Political Behavior, Psychology 873D, Ohio State University.
 The Psychology of Mass Politics, Political Science 894, Ohio State University.
 Questionnaire Design for Attitude Measurement, Psychology 788, Ohio State University.
 Supervisor of graduate student TAs teaching Introduction to Social Psychology, Psychology 320, Ohio State University.
 Introduction to Social Psychology, Psychology H320 & H367.01, Ohio State University.

The Psychology of Public Attitudes, Psychology 630, Ohio State University.

Survey Design, Clinical Research Curriculum Program, College of Medicine, College of Optometry, and School of Public Health, Ohio State University.

Questionnaire Design for Attitude Measurement, Psychology 711, Summer Institute in Survey Research Techniques, University of Michigan.

Cognitive Psychology and Survey Methods, Psychology 988, Summer Institute in Survey Research Techniques, University of Michigan.

Response Scales for Satisfaction Measurement, Joint Program in Survey Methodology, University of Maryland-University of Michigan.

Designing Effective Questionnaires, Methodology Institute, London School of Economics and Political Science, London, United Kingdom.

Techniques for Assessing Questionnaire Quality, Department of Methodology and Statistics, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

Assessment of Questionnaire Quality, Interuniversity Graduate School of Psychometrics and Sociometrics, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

Advanced Issues in Questionnaire Design, Psychology 688, Summer Institute in Survey Research Techniques, University of Michigan.

The Study of Political Change at the Individual Level: The Panel Study, 2001 TMR Winter School in Comparative Electoral Research, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

Aviation Marketing (guest lecture), Aviation and Aeronautical Engineering 654, Ohio State University.

Advanced Questionnaire Design: Maximizing Reliability and Validity, Essex Summer School in Social Science Data Analysis and Collection, Department of Government, University of Essex, UK.

Introduction to Communication Theory (guest lecturer), Communication 311, Stanford University.

Media Technologies, People, and Society (guest lecturer), Communication 1, Stanford University.

Graduate Research Methods (guest lecturer), Psychology 290, Stanford University.

Questionnaire Design for Surveys and Laboratory Experiments: Social and Cognitive Perspectives, Communication 239, Stanford University.

Survey Research Methods: Describing Large Populations with Small Samples and Precise Measures, Communication 135, Stanford University.

Advanced Research Design, Communication 318, Stanford University.

Subjective Measurement in Surveys, Joint Program in Survey Methodology, University of Maryland-University of Michigan.

Summer Institute in Political Psychology (instructor, co-director, and director), Stanford University.

Communication Research Methods, Communication 106/206, Stanford University.

New Models and Methods in the Social Sciences (lecturer), Sociology 384, Stanford University, 2000, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2017.

Coping with Climate Change: Life after Copenhagen (guest lecturer), Continuing Studies Sci 31, Stanford University.

What the American Public Believes about Climate Change (guest lecture), Introduction to Earth Systems, Earth Systems 10, Stanford University.

Language and Attitudes (guest lecture), Topics in Sociolinguistics, Linguistics 259, Stanford University.
The Psychology of Communication about Politics in America, Communication 164, 264; Political Science 224L, 324, Psychology 170, Stanford University.

Introduction to Communication (guest lecture), Communication 1A, Stanford University.

Research Methods Lecture Series (guest lecture on Questionnaire Design), Summer Research College Program, Political Science Department, Stanford University.

Selected News Media Coverage of Research, Interviews, and Quotes

The New York Times	The Chronicle Telegram (Elyria, OH)
The Washington Post	Chronicle of Higher Education
The Wall Street Journal	The Cleveland Plain Dealer
The Christian Science Monitor	The Clovis News Journal (Clovis, NM)
USA Today	The Columbus Dispatch
US News and World Report	The Contra Costa Times (Walnut Creek, CA)
The Economist	The Courier Times (Levittown, PA)
New Scientist Magazine	The Daily Review (Hayward, CA)
Science	The Dallas Morning News
Scientific American	The Dayton Daily News
Nature	The Denver Post
Popular Science	The Desert Sun
Glamour	The Detroit Free Press
Time	The Durango Herald
Newsweek	The Fort Wayne Journal Gazette
Business Week	The Fort Worth Star-Telegram
The Akron Beacon Journal	The Grand Rapids Press
The Alameda Times-Star	The Herald Sun (Durham, NC)
The Appeal-Democrat (Marysville, CA)	The Houston Chronicle
The Athens Banner-Herald	Idaho Press
The Anchorage Daily News	The Indianapolis Star
The Austin American-Statesman	The Kansas City Star
The Bellingham Herald (Bellingham, WA)	The Kentucky Post
The Boston Globe	The Ledger (Lakeland, Florida)
The Bryan-College Station Eagle	The Lansing State Journal
The Bucks County Courier Times	The Lexington Herald Leader
The Buffalo News	The Lincoln Journal Star (Lincoln, NE)
The Centre Daily Times (State College, PA)	The Los Angeles Sentinel
The Charlotte Observer	The Los Angeles Times
The Chattanooga Times Free Press	The Louisville Courier-Journal
The Chicago Tribune	The Manitowoc Herald Times Reporter
The Chicago Sun-Times	

The Metropolitan News-Enterprise (Los Angeles, CA)
 The Miami Herald
 The Minneapolis Star Tribune
 The Mobile Register
 The Monterey County Herald
 The Morning Call (Allentown, PA)
 The Nashua Telegraph
 The New Haven Register
 Niagara Gazette, Niagara Falls, New York
 The Oakland Post
 The Oakland Tribune
 The Ohio County Monitor
 The Orlando Sentinel
 The Philadelphia Inquirer
 The Portland Press Herald
 The Reading Eagle (Reading, PA)
 The Rocky Mountain News
 The Sacramento Bee
 The St. Petersburg Times, St. Petersburg, Florida
 The San Francisco Chronicle
 The San Francisco Examiner
 The Sarasota Herald Tribune
 Savannah Morning News
 The Seattle Times
 The Seattle Post Intelligencer
 The Southern Ledger
 The Spokane Spokesman-Review
 The Springfield News Leader
 The Springville Journal
 The Staten Island Advance
 The Statesman Journal (Salem, Oregon)
 The Scranton Times-Tribune (Scranton, Pennsylvania)
 The Star Democrat (Easton, MD)
 The Syracuse Post-Standard
 The Tampa Tribune
 The Titusville Herald
 The Union-News and Sunday Republican
 The Washington Examiner
 The Washington Times
 The Wenatchee World
 The Wichita Eagle
 The Wisconsin State Journal
 The Worcester Telegram (Massachusetts)
 The York Daily Record
 The York Dispatch (York, PA)
 Ottawa Citizen
 The Jerusalem Post
 Black Star News
 The Economist
 The Financial Times (London)
 The Guardian
 The International Herald Tribune

The Birmingham Post
 The International Herald Tribune
 The Scotsman
 The Sunday Mail
 The Express
 The Stanford Daily
 The Ohio State University Lantern
 The Telegraph-Journal, Saint John, New Brunswick, Canada
 Campaigns and Elections
 Newhouse News Service
 The Associated Press
 United Press International
 Gannett News Service
 Bloomberg
 The Atlantic
 Forbes
 Fortune
 The Nation
 This Magazine
 The Daily Beast
 Grist
 Politifact
 Law 360
 Psychology Today
 California
 Air Safety Weekly
 Mother Jones
 National Journal
 New York Magazine
 Columbia Journalism Review
 American Psychological Association Monitor
 The Voice of America
 ABC World News Sunday
 ABC World News This Morning
 ABC World News Now
 BBC News
 BBC World Service
 MSNBC
 CBC Television News
 CNN, Lou Dobbs Tonight
 Fox News
 WCMH TV, Columbus, Ohio
 WBNS TV, Columbus, Ohio
 Ohio News Network TV, Columbus, Ohio
 WSYX TV, Columbus, Ohio
 WOSU AM, Columbus, Ohio
 WOSU FM, Columbus, Ohio
 KGO-TV, San Francisco, California
 KGO AM, San Francisco, California
 KPCC, Pasadena, California
 KTVU, Oakland, California
 Bloomberg Radio
 Pentagon Channel, Sirius Radio

Air America
 Rush Limbaugh
 Jerry Doyle
 Morning in American (syndicated radio program)
 CSPAN-1
 Washington Week with Gwen Ifill
 New Hampshire Public Radio.
 Weekend Edition Saturday, National Public Radio
 (1992, 2006;
<http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=6471912>)
 Science Friday, National Public Radio (2012,
<http://sciencefriday.com/segment/10/26/2012/in-twitter-we-trust-can-social-media-sway-voters.html>)
 Living on Earth, National Public Radio
 (<http://www.loe.org/shows/shows.htm?programID=06-P13-00015#feature5>)
 The Savage Nation (nationally syndicated radio program)
 Andrew Wilkow, Sirius Patriot 144, Sirius Radio
 The Climate Code, The Weather Channel.
 OnPoint, E&E TV
 (http://www.eandevideo_guide/612?search_term=s=krosnick&page=1&sort_type=date)
 Conde Naste Portfolio
 The Hill
 Discovery News
 International Business Times
 ABCNews.com
 CBSNews.com
 Slate.com
 Aero-news.net
 Naturalnews.com
 Huffingtonpost.com
 Realclearpolitics.com
 PhysOrg.com
 Climateprogress.org
 Climatesciencewatch.org
 DailyKos.com
 Sciencecentric.com
 Miller-McCune.com
 Scienceblogs.com
 Energysavingsweekly.com
 Scientificblogging.com
 Careerscientist.com
 Scienceblogs.com
 Sierraclub.com
 Hillheat.com
 Projectgroundswell.com
 Climatewatch (KQED.org)
 Pollster.com
 Kuratkull.com
 Nature.com

National Review Online
 CNYcentral.com
 WTOP.com
 WBUR
 Treehugger
 Inside EPA
 Grist
 Channel4000.com
 AARP.org
 Pentagraph.com
 Environmentalhealthnews.com
 Wattsupwiththat.com
 Daily.sightline.org
 Alternet.org
 Greenreport.it
 Word.Emerson.edu
 DailyFreePress.com
 Thnkprogress.org
 Podcast: Stanford School of Medicine 1:2:1:
<http://med.stanford.edu/121/2010/krosnick.html>
 “Gibson on Fox”, Fox News Radio
 “To the Point”, KCRW Radio

Theses and Dissertations Supervised

- Boninger, D. S. (1988). The determinants of attitude importance. Master's Thesis. Ohio State University.
- Chuang, Y. C. (1988). The structure of attitude strength. Master's Thesis. Ohio State University.
- Roman, R. J. (1988). A cognitive dissonance interpretation of the timing of punishment. Honors Thesis. Ohio State University.
- Chuang, Y. C. (1989). Policy voting and persuasion in American presidential elections: The role of attitude importance. Ph.D. Dissertation. Ohio State University.
- Kost, K. A. (1989). Complexity as a situationally modifiable property of cognitive structure. Master's Thesis. Ohio State University.
- Li, F. (1989). Order of information acquisition and the effect of base-rates on social judgments. Master's Thesis. Ohio State University.
- Berent, M. K. (1990). Attitude importance and the recall of attitude-relevant information. Master's Thesis. Ohio State University.
- Betz, A. L. (1990). Backward conditioning of attitudes using subliminal photographic stimuli. Master's Thesis. Ohio State University.
- Fabrigar, L. R. (1991). The effect of question order and attitude importance on the false consensus effect. Master's Thesis. Ohio State University.
- Reed, D. R. (1991). Associative memory structure and the evaluation of political leaders. Ph.D. Dissertation. Ohio State University.
- Berent, M. K. (1994). Attitude importance and information processing. Ph.D. Dissertation. Ohio State University.
- Narayan, S. S. (1994). Response effects in attitude surveys: An examination of the satisficing explanation. Master's Thesis. Ohio State University.
- Miller, J. M. (1994). Mediators and moderators of agenda-setting and priming. Master's Thesis. Ohio State University.
- Smith, W. A. (1995). Mental coin-flipping and non-differentiation in surveys: Tests of satisficing hypotheses. Honors Thesis. Ohio State University.
- Visser, P. S. (1995). The relation between age and susceptibility to attitude change: A new approach to an old question. Master's Thesis. Ohio State University.
- Narayan, S. S. (1995). Satisficing in attitude surveys: The impact of cognitive skills, motivation, and task difficulty on response effects. Ph.D. Dissertation. Ohio State University.

- Ankerbrand, A. L. (1997). Attitude formation and the bivariate model: A study of the relationship between beliefs and attitudes. Master's Thesis. Ohio State University.
- Bizer, G. Y. (1997). The relation between attitude importance and attitude accessibility. Master's Thesis. Ohio State University.
- Visser, P. S. (1998). Testing the common-factors model of attitude strength. Ph.D. Dissertation. Ohio State University.
- Miller, J. M. (2000). Threats and opportunities as motivators of political activism. Ph.D. Dissertation. Ohio State University.
- Chang, L. (2001). A comparison of Samples and response quality obtained from RDD telephone survey methodology and Internet survey methodology. Ph.D. Dissertation. Ohio State University.
- Holbrook, A. L. (2002). Operative and meta-psychological strength-related attitude features: A study of knowledge volume, ambivalence, and accessibility. Ph.D. Dissertation. Ohio State University.
- Lampron, S. F. (2002). Self-interest, values, involvement, and susceptibility to attitude change. Master's Thesis. Ohio State University.
- Shaeffer, E. M. (2003). Response effects in questionnaires: A comparison of minimally balanced and fully balanced forced choice questions and rating and ranking procedures. Master's Thesis. Ohio State University.
- Pfent, A. (2004). Rationalization of candidate preferences: New evidence of determinants of attitude change. Master's Thesis. Ohio State University.
- Lein, J. (2006). Issue saliency in proximity and directional voting models: A 1996 case study. Honors thesis. Stanford University.
- Miller, L. E. (2007). Voting in ballot initiative elections. Ph.D. Dissertation. Stanford University.
- Bannon, B. (2008). Tell it like it is: News media priming – Extensions and applications. Ph.D. Dissertation. Stanford University.
- Blocksom, D. (2008). The ballot order effect: The 2004 Presidential election in Ohio. Honors Thesis. Stanford University.
- Chen, E. (2008). Me first! Assessing the significance of ballot order effects on elections in North Dakota. Honors Thesis. Stanford University.
- Chiang, I. A. (2008). The principle of congruence in asking questions. Ph.D. Dissertation. Stanford University.
- Garland, P. (2008). Still hoping for separate and unequal: New perspective son racial attitudes and media in America. Ph.D. Dissertation. Stanford University.
- Harder, J. (2008). Why do people vote? The relationship between political efficacy and voter turnout. Honors Thesis. Stanford University.

- Malhotra, N. (2008). Essays on survey methodology and bandwagon effects. Ph.D. Dissertation. Stanford University.
- Schneider, D. (2008). Measurement in surveys and elections: Interviewer effects in election surveys, name order on election ballots, and customer satisfaction surveys. Ph.D. Dissertation. Stanford University.
- Gauthier, L. D. (2010). The false consensus effect: Projection or conformity? Ph.D. Dissertation. Stanford University.
- Abbasi, D. R. (2011). Americans and climate change: Elite understanding of the gap between science and action. Ph.D. Dissertation. Stanford University.
- Pasek, J. M. H. (2011). Communication through elections: Three studies exploring the determinants of citizen behavior. Ph.D. Dissertation. Stanford University.
- Larson, S. (2011). American concern for the environment: Survey question wording and why it matters for environmental policy. Honors Thesis. Stanford University.
- Lelkes, Y. (2012). Essays on the measurement of public opinion. Ph.D. Dissertation. Stanford University.
- Gross, W. (2012). Opinions about Hispanics: Causes and consequences. Ph.D. Dissertation. Stanford University.
- PonTell, E. (2012). Do sweets make you sweeter? Sweet food consumption and acquiescence response bias. Honors Thesis. Stanford University.
- Kim, N. (2013). Difference and Democracy: Encountering difference in Democratic dialogues. Ph.D. Dissertation. Stanford University.
- Eddy, G. M. (2013). Remediating a data deficit: A regression analysis of public opinion on healthcare reform. Honors Thesis. Stanford University.
- Cho, A. (2016). The psychology of economic voting: How voters use economic information to inform their political choices. Honors Thesis. Stanford University.
- Slavec, A. (2016). Improving survey question wording using language resources. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Ljubljana, Slovenia.
- Vannette, D. L. (2017). Predicting and influencing behavior with surveys. Ph.D. Dissertation. Stanford University.
- Kim, S. (2017). The influence of others: The impact of perceptions of others' opinions on individual attitudes and behavioral intentions. Ph.D. Dissertation. Stanford University.
- Höhne, J. K. (2017). Question format, response effort, and response quality – A methodological comparison of agree/disagree and item-specific questions. Ph.D. Dissertation. Georg-August-Universität Göttingen.

Professional Association Memberships

American Psychological Association
Society of Experiment Social Psychology
Society for Personal and Social Psychology
American Political Science Association
American Association for Public Opinion Research

Revised: December, 2018.

Appendix B
Survey Questionnaire

PROGRAMMING NOTES:

- Throughout, horizontal lines indicate page breaks
 - Respondents will be randomly assigned to see one kind of dog food using the variable “fc”:
 - IF = 1, RESPONDENT WILL SEE ORIJEN REGIONAL RED
 - IF = 2, RESPONDENT WILL SEE ACANA REGIONALS APPALACHIAN RANCH
 - IF = 3, RESPONDENT WILL SEE ACANA HERITAGE RED MEAT
 - Respondents will be randomly assigned to see or not see a set of information about pentobarbital
 - IF pento = 1, respondents will see the information set 1: “The dog food you saw may contain a drug called pentobarbital. According to the U.S. government, pentobarbital is used to calm animals, to put them to sleep, to reduce their feelings of pain, and to end their lives.”
 - IF pento = 2, respondents will see the information set 2: “According to the U.S. government, the dog food you saw was made with meat products provided by a company that did not make sure to keep out meat from animals whose lives had been ended by giving them a drug called pentobarbital.”
 - IF pento=3, respondents will see no information
 - TST will provide randomizations for USC’s use.
 - RECORD THE NUMBER OF SECONDS THAT EACH RESPONDENT SAW EACH SCREEN.
 - IF A RESPONDENT SKIPS A QUESTION WITHOUT ANSWERING IT, REDISPLAY THE SCREEN AND PUT THE FOLLOWING TEXT IN YELLOW AT THE TOP OF THE SCREEN: “We noticed that you didn’t answer the question below. We would be really grateful if you’d be willing to answer it as accurately as you can, even if you’re not completely sure of your answer. But if you prefer not to answer the question, just click on the “Next” button below.”
-

INTRO1. Thank you for participating in this research.

Please complete this questionnaire all at one time without taking a break - it should take you about 25 minutes.

After you answer each question, you can move on to the next question by clicking the “Next” button at the bottom of the screen.

INTRO2. Please do not click your browser’s forward or back button. If you do, you will have to start the questionnaire again from the beginning.

DOG_EVER. To begin, have you ever owned a dog, or have you never owned a dog?

- Have owned a dog
- Have never owned a dog

PRODUCT_INSTRUCTION.

On the next screens, you will see pictures of a dog food sold in the U.S.

Please look at each picture carefully. After you have finished looking at each picture, please click the “Next” button to move to the next screen.

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

This is the front of the bag




DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

This is a close-up of the top part of the front of the bag



DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

This is a close-up of the middle part of the front of the bag



DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

This is a close-up of the bottom part of the front of the bag



DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

On the next few screens, you will see the words that are printed on the front of the bag you just saw. Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

EASY OPEN LIFT AND PULL TAB TO YOUR RIGHT

DO NOT CUT

Orijen®

NOURISH AS NATURE INTENDED

AMERICA'S VAST AND FERTILE LANDS-OUR SOURCE OF INSPIRATION AND FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

WHOLEPREY™ DIET

MEAT | ORGANS | CARTILAGE

85% MEAT AND FISH INGREDIENTS +

15% VEGETABLES | FRUITS | BOTANICALS + ESSENTIAL VITAMINS & MINERALS +

0% GRAIN | POTATO | TAPIOCA | PLANT PROTEIN CONCENTRATES

PREMIUM MEAT AND FISH INGREDIENTS 2/3 FRESH OR RAW AND 1/3 DRIED

*Plus natural preservatives. Contains a source of live (viable) naturally occurring microorganisms.

Regional Red

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ DOG FOOD

MADE WITH REGIONAL RED MEATS DELIVERED FRESH OR RAW DAILY

ANGUS BEEF, WILD BOAR, BOER GOAT, ROMNEY LAMB, YORKSHIRE PORK & WILD-CAUGHT MACKEREL

BA

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™

PROTEIN-RICH | CARBOHYDRATE-LIMITED

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

10 FRESH OR RAW

TOP 10 FRESH OR RAW

PREMIUM ANIMAL INGREDIENTS

WHOLEPREY™ DIET

MEAT | ORGANS | CARTILAGE

LOW TEMP 200°F

LOW TEMPERATURE

PREMIUM MEAT INGREDIENTS

FD

FREEZE-DRIED LIVER

INFUSED FOR NATURAL FLAVOR

MADE IN OUR USA KENTUCKY KITCHENS | PREPARED WITH PRIDE FROM
TRUSTED REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

*MAXIMUM 20% CARBOHYDRATE (AS ESTIMATED BY NFE)

Orijen®

NOURISH AS NATURE INTENDED

Regional Red

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ DOG FOOD

NET WEIGHT 13 LB | 5.9 KG

WHOLEPREY™ DIET | 85 15 0

DOG FOOD FOR ALL BREEDS AND LIFE STAGES

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

This is the back of the bag



DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

This is a close-up of the top part of the back of the bag



DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

This is a close-up of the middle part of the back of the bag



DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

This is a close-up of the bottom part of the back of the bag



DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

On the next few screens, you will see the words that are printed on the back of the bag you saw earlier. Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

Orijen®

NOURISH AS NATURE INTENDED

AWARD-WINNING BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ DOG FOOD

2014

LEADERSHIP AWARDS “FOOD INNOVATION”

2015

ALBERTA EXPORT AWARD FOR CONSUMER PRODUCTS

2015

TOP 10 BEST DOG FOOD BRANDS

REVIEWS.COM

2015

INNOVATION AWARD

PETFOOD & ANIMAL NUTRITION 2.0

2015 | 2016

ALBERTA AWARD OF DISTINCTION

2015-2016

EXCELLENCE IN CANINE PET FOOD

GLYCEMIC RESEARCH INSTITUTE WASHINGTON DC

TRUSTED EVERYWHERE.

TRUSTED BY PET LOVERS EVERYWHERE, ORIJEN IS THE FULLEST EXPRESSION OF OUR BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ AND FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS COMMITMENT.

Brimming with Angus beef, wild boar, Boer goat, Romney lamb, whole wild-caught Atlantic mackerel and Yorkshire pork delivered from our region FRESH or RAW each day, ORIJEN Regional Red is loaded with goodness and taste.

Prepared exclusively in our state-of-the-art DogStar® Kitchens, award-winning ORIJEN is guaranteed to keep your cherished dog happy, healthy and strong.

Reinhard Muhlenfeld

Founder

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™

NOURISH AS NATURE INTENDED-ORIJEN mirrors the richness, freshness and variety of WholePrey™ meats that dogs are evolved to eat.

FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

GROWN CLOSE TO HOME-We focus on local ingredients that are ethically raised by people we know and trust, and delivered to our kitchens fresh or raw each day.

NEVER OUTSOURCED

PREPARED EXCLUSIVELY IN OUR DOGSTAR® KITCHENS-We don't make foods for other companies and we don't allow our foods to be made by anyone else.

PEOPLE WE TRUST

INGREDIENTS WE LOVE FROM PEOPLE WE KNOW AND TRUST

Kentucky Proud™

JONATHAN OF JSW FARMS IN LIBERTY, KENTUCKY. TRUSTED SUPPLIER OF FRESH LOCAL BEEF.

OUR DOGSTAR® KITCHENS

AWARD-WINNING FOODS

AWARD-WINNING KITCHENS

MATTHEW, COMMITTED TO FOOD SAFETY AND TRUSTED QUALITY.

FRESH AND REGIONAL

DELIVERED DAILY FROM LOCAL FARMS AND RANCHES

GRASS-FED KENTUCKY LAMB. DELIVERED FRESH OR RAW DAILY.

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

THIS 13 LB PACKAGE OF ORIJEN REGIONAL RED IS MADE WITH OVER 11 LB* OF FRESH, RAW OR DRIED ANIMAL INGREDIENTS | 2/3 FRESH OR RAW + 1/3 DRIED*

3 LB* FRESH BEEF, ORGANS, CARTILAGE +

1 1/4 LB* FRESH OR RAW WILD BOAR, ORGANS +

1/2 LB* FRESH BOER GOAT +

1 3/5 LB* FRESH OR RAW LAMB, MUTTON, ORGANS +

1/2 LB* FRESH OR RAW WHOLE ATLANTIC MACKEREL +

1 LB* FRESH PORK, ORGANS, CARTILAGE

PLUS 3 1/4 LB OF GENTLY DEHYDRATED BEEF, GOAT, LAMB, MACKEREL AND HERRING

*APPROXIMATE INCLUSIONS.

WHOLEPREY™ DIET

MEAT | ORGANS | CARTILAGE

IN HER INFINITE WISDOM, MOTHER NATURE MATCHED THE NUTRIENTS IN WHOLE PREY ANIMALS TO PERFECTLY MEET YOUR DOG'S DIETARY NEEDS.

That's why ORIJEN REGIONAL RED features richly nourishing ratios of fresh meats, organs, cartilage and fresh whole fish, providing a concentrated source of virtually every nutrient your dog needs, without long lists of synthetic supplements.

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

LOW TEMP 200°F

LOW TEMPERATURE

PREMIUM DRIED RED MEAT AND FISH INGREDIENTS

MOST PET FOODS ARE MADE WITH MEAT AND FISH MEALS, INGREDIENTS THAT ARE RENDERED AT A HIGH TEMPERATURE FROM ANIMAL BY-PRODUCTS.

ORIJEN REGIONAL RED features premium dried meat and fish, prepared at a low temperature (200°F) from fresh ingredients that meet European Union Certification Standards-gently concentrating their goodness into a richly nourishing source of protein.

MADE IN OUR USA KENTUCKY KITCHENS

ORIJEN REGIONAL RED

MODERN DOGS ARE BUILT LIKE THEIR ANCESTORS, WE BELIEVE THEY SHOULD EAT LIKE THEM TOO.

That's why ORIJEN REGIONAL RED is loaded with Angus beef, wild boar, Boer goat, Romney lamb and Yorkshire pork, delivered FRESH or RAW in nourishing WholePrey™ ratios and brimming with goodness and taste.

Prepared in our DogStar® Kitchens, award-winning ORIJEN is guaranteed to keep your dog healthy, happy and strong.

Read our ingredients and we think you'll agree.

DISPLAY IF $f_c = 1$

INGREDIENTS

Deboned beef, deboned wild boar, deboned goat, deboned lamb, lamb liver, beef liver, beef tripe, wild boar liver, deboned mutton, beef heart, whole atlantic mackerel, deboned pork, goat meal, beef meal, lamb meal, mackerel meal, whole red lentils, whole pinto beans, beef kidney, pork liver, herring meal, mutton meal, whole green peas, whole green lentils, whole navy beans, whole chickpeas, natural pork flavor, beef fat, lentil fiber, pork kidney, alaskan pollock oil, whole yellow peas, lamb tripe, wild boar heart, wild boar cartilage, beef cartilage, whole pumpkin, whole butternut squash, mixed tocopherols (preservative), dried kelp, zinc proteinate, kale, spinach, mustard greens, collard greens, turnip greens, whole carrots, whole apples, whole pears, freeze-dried beef liver, freeze-dried beef tripe, freeze-dried lamb liver, freeze-dried lamb tripe, pumpkin seeds, sunflower seeds, chicory root, turmeric, sarsaparilla root, althea root, rosehips, juniper berries, dried lactobacillus acidophilus fermentation product, dried bifidobacterium animalis fermentation product, dried lactobacillus casei fermentation product.

GUARANTEED ANALYSIS

Crude protein (min.)	38%
Crude fat (min.)	18%

Crude fiber (max.)	4%
Moisture (max.)	12%
DHA (docosahexaenoic acid) (min.)	0.4%
EPA (eicosapentaenoic acid) (min.)	0.2%
Calcium (min.)	1.9%
Phosphorus (min.)	1.4%
Omega-6 fatty acids* (min.)	2%
Omega-3 fatty acids* (min.)	1%
Glucosamine* (min.)	400 mg/kg
Chondroitin sulfate* (min.)	400 mg/kg
Total Microorganisms* (min.)	100M CFU/lb
(Lactobacillus acidophilus, Bifidobacterium animalis, Lactobacillus casei)	

*Not recognized as an essential nutrient by the AAFCO Dog Food Nutrient Profiles

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

CALORIE CONTENT

Calorie content (calculated): ME 3860 kcal/kg, 440 kcal per 8 oz cup.

Calories distributed to support peak conditioning with 39% from protein, 19% from vegetables and fruits, and 42% from fat.

MADE BY CHAMPION PETFOODS USA INC.

12871 BOWLING GREEN ROAD

AUBURN, KENTUCKY 42206

US REG. 15415996410 | EU REG.

CHAMPIONPETFOODS.COM

DOGSTAR® KITCHENS

CUSTOMER CARE (USA)

TOLL FREE 1.877.939.0006

FOLLOW US ONLINE

ORIJEN.CA

@ORIJENPETFOOD @CHAMPIONPETFOOD

REGIONAL RED FOR DOGS

13 LB | 5.9 KG

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

This is one side of the bag



DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

On the next screen, you will see the words that are printed on one side of the bag you saw earlier. Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

MADE IN OUR USA KENTUCKY KITCHENS

DAILY RATION AND FEEDING GUIDE

8 OZ CUP IS 114 G OF FOOD

DOG WEIGHT		LESS ACTIVE (1 hour or LESS daily exercise)		ACTIVE (1 hour or MORE daily exercise)	
LB	KG	CUPS/DAY	GR/DAY	CUPS/DAY	GR/DAY
4 1/2 lb	2 kg	1/4 c	28 g	1/3 c	38 g
11 lb	5 kg	1/2 c	57 g	3/4 c	86 g
22 lb	10 kg	3/4 c	86 g	1 1/3 c	152 g
44 lb	20 kg	1 1/2 c	171 g	2 1/4 c	257 g
66 lb	30 kg	2 c	228 g	3 c	342 g

88 lb	40 kg	2 1/2 c	285 g	3 3/4 c	428 g
110 lb	50 kg	3 c	342 g	4 1/2 c	513 g
132 lb	60 kg	3 1/3 c	380 g	5 c	570 g

EVERY DOG IS DIFFERENT.

Just like you, your dog is a unique individual with feeding requirements that will vary with environment, age and activity.

This chart provides an initial guide, and we suggest monitoring your dog's weight and adjusting amounts as needed. Feed twice daily, and always keep fresh, clean water available.

PUPPIES: at 1 1/2-3months old feed twice the adult amount. At 3-6 months feed 1 1/2 times the adult amount. At 6-11 months feed 1 1/4 times the adult amount.

GESTATION: increase from 25% to 50% of the adult amount. LACTATION: feed "free choice."

ORIJEN Regional Red Dog is formulated to meet the nutritional levels established by the AAFCO Dog Food Nutrient Profiles for All Life Stages, except for growth of large size dogs (70 lb. or more as an adult).

DISPLAY IF fc = 1

This is the other side of the bag



DISPLAY IF fc = 1

On the next screen, you will see the words that are printed on the other side of the bag you saw earlier. Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

DISPLAY IF fc = 1

Regional Red

WHOLEPREY™ DIET | 85 15 0

MADE IN OUR USA KENTUCKY KITCHENS

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

This is the front of the bag



DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

This is a close-up of the top part of the front of the bag



DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

This is a close-up of the middle part of the front of the bag



DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

This is a close-up of the bottom part of the front of the bag



DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

On the next few screens, you will see the words that are printed on the front of the bag you just saw. Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

EASY OPEN | LIFT AND PULL TAB TO YOUR RIGHT

DO NOT CUT

AMERICAN CHOICE AWARDS 2017

VOTED Best Brand

National Winner ★★★★★

REGIONALS

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ | REGIONALLY INSPIRED

UNMATCHED REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

FRESH OR RAW

ETHICALLY RAISED on AMERICAN FARMS & RANCHES

ANGUS BEEF Wolfe County, KY

YORKSHIRE PORK Rockfield, KY

GRASS-FED LAMB Garrard County, KY

FRESHWATER CATFISH Livingston County, KY

AMERICAN BISON Shelbyville, KY

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ RATIOS

70% RED MEAT & FISH INGREDIENTS

INCLUDING MEAT, LIVER, TRIPE AND CARTILAGE

30% VEGETABLES, FRUITS & BOTANICALS

ESSENTIAL VITAMINS AND MINERALS*

0% NO GRAIN, POTATO, TAPIOCA

GLUTENS OR ANY OTHER PLANT PROTEIN CONCENTRATES

* Plus natural preservatives. Contains a source of live (viable) naturally occurring microorganisms.

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

WHOLEPREY™ DIET

MEAT | ORGANS | CARTILAGE

ACANA®

AMERICA'S FERTILE FARMS AND RANCHES

OUR SOURCE OF INSPIRATION AND FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

Appalachian Ranch

with RANCH-RAISED RED MEATS & FRESHWATER CATFISH

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ | REGIONALLY INSPIRED

BA

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™

PROTEIN-RICH, CARBOHYDRATE-LIMITED*

WHOLEPREY DIET™

MEAT, LIVER, TRIPE AND CARTILAGE

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

TOP SIX INGREDIENTS

FROM RANCH-RAISED BEEF, PORK AND LAMB

FD

HIGH PALATABILITY

INFUSED WITH FREEZE-DRIED BEEF AND LAMB LIVER

FRESH AND LOCAL

KENTUCKY VEGETABLES, FRUITS AND BOTANICALS

*MAXIMUM 25% CARBOHYDRATE (AS ESTIMATED BY NFE)

COMPLETE FOOD

FOR DOGS

ALL BREEDS | ALL LIFE STAGES

NET WEIGHT

13 LB | 5.9 KG

MADE IN OUR USA KENTUCKY KITCHENS

PREPARED WITH PRIDE FROM TRUSTED REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

ACANA®

REGIONALS

Appalachian Ranch

with RANCH-RAISED RED MEATS & FRESHWATER CATFISH

COMPLETE FOOD

FOR DOGS

ALL BREEDS | ALL LIFE STAGES

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

This is the back of the bag



DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

This is a close-up of the top part of the back of the bag



This is a close-up of the middle part of the back of the bag



This is a close-up of the bottom part of the back of the bag



On the next few screens, you will see the words that are printed on the back of the bag you saw earlier. Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

ACANA

OUR MISSION IS CLEAR AND STRONG.

We've been making BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ ACANA dog foods from FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS in our AWARD-WINNING KITCHENS since 1985.

Regionally inspired, ACANA REGIONALS are Biologically Appropriate™ foods, brimming with ranch-raised meats, free-run poultry, nest-laid eggs and wild-caught fish, plus sun-ripened

vegetables, fruits and botanicals-grown close to home by people we trust and delivered to our kitchens FRESH or RAW, so they're bursting with goodness and taste.

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™

Our foods mirror the richness, freshness and variety of meats for which DOGS ARE EVOLVED TO EAT.

FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

We focus on fresh ingredients from our region that are ranched, farmed or fished by people we know and trust.

NEVER OUTSOURCED

We prepare our OWN FOODS in our OWN KITCHENS and we DON'T make foods for anyone else.

REGIONALS

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ | REGIONALLY INSPIRED

INGREDIENTS WE LOVE

PEOPLE WE TRUST

FOOD CHOICES ARE SOME OF OUR MOST IMPORTANT DECISIONS AND KNOWING WHERE YOUR FOOD IS FROM HAS TAKEN ON NEW IMPORTANCE.

That's why we make ACANA in our own kitchens, from Fresh Regional Ingredients raised by people we trust, like Rob of Bluegrass Bison in Shelbyville, Kentucky-trusted supplier of fresh ranch-raised bison.

DISPLAY IF fc = 2

ROB OF BLUEGRASS BISON IN SHELBYVILLE, KENTUCKY. TRUSTED SUPPLIERS OF FRESH RANCH-RAISED BISON.

Appalachian Ranch

REGIONALS FORMULA

COMPLETE FOOD

FOR DOGS

ALL BREEDS | ALL LIFE STAGES

HONORING THE APPALACHIAN RANCHING HERITAGE, THIS REGION-INSPIRED DOG FOOD IS LOADED WITH ANGUS BEEF, AMERICAN YORKSHIRE PORK, KENTUCKY LAMB AND AMERICAN BISON, PLUS LOCAL VEGETABLES, FRUITS AND BOTANICALS.

Delivered FRESH or RAW, in WholePrey™ ratios, and brimming with goodness and taste, ACANA's high inclusions and rich diversity of meats, organs and cartilage mirror your dog's evolutionary diet and nourish peak health naturally, without the need for long lists of synthetic ingredients and supplements.

Prepared in our Kentucky DogStar® Kitchens with Fresh Regional Ingredients, this unique and Biologically Appropriate™ food is guaranteed to keep your dog healthy, happy and strong. Read our ingredients and we think you'll agree!

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

INGREDIENTS

Deboned beef, deboned pork, deboned lamb, lamb meal, beef meal, pork meal, whole red lentils, whole pinto beans, beef liver, beef fat, whole green lentils, whole green peas, whole chickpeas, catfish meal, deboned bison, whole blue catfish, pollock oil, lentil fiber, natural pork flavor, whole yellow peas, beef tripe, mutton tripe, lamb liver, pork liver, beef kidney, pork kidney, beef cartilage, whole pumpkin, whole butternut squash, mixed tocopherols (preservative), sea salt, zinc proteinate, dried kelp, kale, spinach, mustard greens, collard greens, turnip greens, whole carrots, whole apples, whole pears, vitamin A acetate, vitamin D3 supplement, freeze-dried beef liver, freeze-dried lamb liver, pumpkin seeds, sunflower seeds, copper proteinate, chicory root, turmeric, sarsaparilla root, althea root, rosehips, juniper berries, dried lactobacillus acidophilus fermentation product, dried bifidobacterium animalis fermentation product, dried lactobacillus casei fermentation product.

CALORIE CONTENT (calculated): Metabolizable Energy is 3405 kcal/kg (388 kcal per 8 oz cup).

Calories distributed to support peak conditioning with 34% from protein, 24% from carbohydrates, and 42% from fat.

GUARANTEED ANALYSIS

Crude protein (min.)	33%
Crude fat (min.)	17%
Crude fiber (max.)	6%

Moisture (max.)	12%
DHA (docosahexaenoic acid) (min.)	0.1%
EPA (eicosapentaenoic acid) (min.)	0.1%
Calcium (min.)	1.7%
Phosphorus (min.)	1.2%
Omega-6 fatty acids* (min.)	1.8%
Omega-3 fatty acids* (min.)	0.6%
Glucosamine* (min.)	250 mg/kg
Total Microorganisms* (min.)	100M CFU/lb
(Lactobacillus acidophilus, Bifidobacterium animalis, Lactobacillus casei)	

*Not recognized as an essential nutrient by the AAFCO Dog Food Nutrient Profiles

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

DAILY RATION AND FEEDING GUIDE

8 OZ CUP IS 114 G OF FOOD

DOG WEIGHT		LESS ACTIVE 1 hour or LESS daily exercise		ACTIVE 1 hour or MORE daily exercise	
LB	KG	CUPS/DAY	GR/DAY	CUPS/DAY	GR/DAY
4 lb	2 kg	1/3 c	38 g	1/2 c	57 g
11 lb	5 kg	2/3 c	76 g	1 c	114 g
22 lb	10 kg	1 c	114 g	1 1/2 c	171 g
44 lb	20 kg	1 2/3 c	190 g	2 1/2 c	285 g
66 lb	30 kg	2 1/3 c	266 g	3 1/2 c	399 g
88 lb	40 kg	3 c	342 g	4 1/4 c	485 g
110 lb	50 kg	3 1/3 c	380 g	5 c	570 g
132 lb	60 kg	4 c	456 g	5 3/4 c	656 g

EVERY DOG IS DIFFERENT. FEEDING AMOUNT WILL VARY WITH AGE AND ACTIVITY.

Use this chart as an initial guide and adjust amounts accordingly.

Feed twice daily and always provide fresh clean water.

PUPPIES: at 1 1/2-3 months old feed twice the adult amount, at 3-6 months feed 1 1/2 times the adult amount. At 6-11 months feed 1 1/4 times the adult amount.

GESTATION: increase from 25% to 50% of the adult amount.

LACTATION: feed “free choice.”

ACANA Appalachian Ranch Dog is formulated to meet the nutritional levels established by the AAFCO Dog Food Nutrient Profiles for All Life Stages, except for growth of large size dogs (70 lb or more as an adult).

Made with UNMATCHED REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

DELIVERED FRESH

THIS 13 LB PACKAGE OF ACANA IS MADE WITH OVER 9 LB PREMIUM ANIMAL INGREDIENTS

Half are FRESH or RAW and loaded with goodness and taste, and half are DRIED or OILS that provide a strong and natural source of animal proteins and fats.

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

2 LB* BEEF, LIVER, TRIPE +

1 LB* PORK, LIVER, KIDNEY +

3/4 LB* LAMB, LIVER, TRIPE +

6 1/2 OZ* FRESHWATER CATFISH +

6 1/2 OZ* AMERICAN BISON

PLUS 4 1/2 LB* OF DRIED BEEF, PORK, LAMB AND FISH INGREDIENTS

*APPROXIMATE AMOUNTS

WHOLEPREY™ DIET

MEAT | ORGANS | CARTILAGE

IN HER ETERNAL WISDOM, MOTHER NATURE MATCHED THE NUTRIENTS FOUND
IN WHOLE FISH, FOWL AND GAME TO PERFECTLY MEET THE NEEDS OF YOUR
DOG.

Mirroring Mother Nature, ACANA WholePrey™ foods feature a nourishing balance of meat,
liver, tripe, kidney and cartilage-all of which reflect the whole prey animal, DELIVERING
NUTRIENTS NATURALLY.

That's why you won't find long lists of synthetic additives in ACANA foods.

OUR INGREDIENTS.

OUR KITCHENS.

OUR FOOD.

TRUSTED EVERYWHERE.

JOHN OF ROUNDSTONE NATIVE SEED IN UPTON, KENTUCKY.

TRUSTED SUPPLIER OF FRESH AND LOCAL BOTANICALS.

Kentucky Proud

MADE IN KENTUCKY BY CHAMPION PETFOODS USA INC.

12871 BOWLING GREEN ROAD, AUBURN, KENTUCKY 42206

US REG. 15415996410 | EU REG.

CHAMPIONPETFOODS.COM

DOGSTAR

KITCHENS

CUSTOMER CARE (USA)

TOLL FREE 1.877.939.0006

FOLLOW US ONLINE

ACANA.COM

@ACANAPETFOOD @CHAMPIONPETFOOD

AD_003

APPALACHIAN RANCH DOG REGIONALS FORMULA

13 LB | 5.9 KG

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

This is one side of the bag



DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

On the next screen, you will see the words that are printed on one side of the bag you saw earlier. Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

UNMATCHED REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

FRESH OR RAW

ETHICALLY RAISED on AMERICAN FARMS & RANCHES

REGIONALS

Appalachian Ranch

with RANCH-RAISED RED MEATS & FRESHWATER CATFISH

COMPLETE FOOD

FOR DOGS

ALL BREEDS | ALL LIFE STAGES

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

This is the other side of the bag



DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

On the next screen, you will see the words that are printed on the other side of the bag you saw earlier. Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

MADE IN OUR USA KENTUCKY KITCHENS

Made with unmatched REGIONAL INGREDIENTS KENTUCKY KITCHENS

REGIONALS

Appalachian Ranch

with RANCH-RAISED RED MEATS & FRESHWATER CATFISH

COMPLETE FOOD

FOR DOGS

ALL BREEDS | ALL LIFE STAGES

DISPLAY IF $f_c = 3$

This is the front of the bag



DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

This is a close-up of the top part of the front of the bag



DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

This is a close-up of the middle part of the front of the bag



DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

This is a close-up of the bottom part of the front of the bag



DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

On the next few screens, you will see the words that are printed on the front of the bag you just saw. Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

EASY OPEN

LIFT AND PULL TAB TO YOUR RIGHT

DO NOT CUT

AMERICAN CHOICE AWARDS VOTED Best Brand National Winner

UNMATCHED REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

DELIVERED FRESH OR RAW

ANGUS BEEF Liberty, Kentucky

+

YORKSHIRE PORK Fannettsburg, Pennsylvania

+

GRASS-FED LAMB Russellville, Kentucky

+

VEGETABLES & FRUITS Kentucky farms

NON-GMO INGREDIENTS FROM AMERICAN RANCHES AND FARMS

ACANA®

HERITAGE

OUR ORIGINAL BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ FOODS

AMERICA'S FERTILE FARMS AND RANCHES

OUR SOURCE OF INSPIRATION AND FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

RED MEAT FORMULA with FRESH ANGUS BEEF, YORKSHIRE PORK & GRASS-FED LAMB

60% PREMIUM MEAT INGREDIENTS

IN NOURISHING WHOLEPREY™ RATIOS

40% VEGETABLES, FRUITS, BOTANICALS

PLUS ESSENTIAL VITAMINS AND MINERALS†

0% GRAIN, POTATO, GLUTENS

POULTRY BY-PRODUCTS, PLANT PROTEIN CONCENTRATES

*MAXIMUM 30% CARBOHYDRATE (AS ESTIMATED BY NFE)

USA AWARD-WINNING DOGSTAR® KITCHENS

SAFE QUALITY FOOD CERTIFIED KITCHEN

†Plus natural preservatives. Contains a source of live (viable) naturally occurring microorganisms.

DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

WHOLEPREY™ DIET

MEAT | ORGANS | CARTILAGE

ACANA®

AMERICA'S FERTILE FARMS AND RANCHES

OUR SOURCE OF INSPIRATION AND FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

Appalachian Ranch

with RANCH-RAISED RED MEATS & FRESHWATER CATFISH

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ | REGIONALLY INSPIRED

BA

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™

PROTEIN-RICH, CARBOHYDRATE-LIMITED*

WHOLEPREY DIET™

MEAT, LIVER, TRIPE AND CARTILAGE

DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™

RICH IN ANIMAL PROTEIN, CARBOHYDRATE-LIMITED*

WHOLEPREY™ SUPERFOOD

MEAT + ORGANS + CARTILAGE

FRESH AND REGIONAL

LOCAL INGREDIENTS DELIVERED DAILY

FD

NATURAL PALATABILITY

INFUSED WITH FREEZE-DRIED LAMB LIVER

ALL BREEDS

ALL LIFE STAGES

NET WEIGHT 13 LB | 5.9 KG

DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

This is the back of the bag

ACANA HERITAGE

OUR FOOD. OUR HERITAGE.

Prepared to our Biologically Appropriate™ standards and brimming with Fresh Regional Ingredients, ACANA HERITAGE celebrates our quarter-century tradition of preparing award-winning foods with exceptional value.

RED MEAT FORMULA

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™

7 3/4 LB

PREMIUM ANIMAL INGREDIENTS

1 1/4 LB* FRESH BEEF | **1 1/4 LB* FRESH PORK** | **1/2 LB* FRESH LAMB**

SUPERFOOD FOR DOGS

FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

50% FRESH 50% DRIED

FRESH VEGETABLES & FRUITS

NEVER OUTSOURCED

DOGSTAR

OUR INGREDIENTS. OUR KITCHENS. OUR FOOD. TRUSTED EVERYWHERE.

DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

This is a close-up of the top part of the back of the bag



DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

This is a close-up of the middle part of the back of the bag



DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

This is a close-up of the bottom part of the back of the bag



DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

On the next few screens, you will see the words that are printed on the back of the bag you saw earlier. Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

KELLY OF M&E FAMILY FARMS IN RUSSELLVILLE, KENTUCKY. TRUSTED
SUPPLIER OF FRESH LOCAL LAMB.

Kentucky Proud

ACANA®

HERITAGE

OUR ORIGINAL BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ FOODS

OUR FOOD. OUR HERITAGE.

Prepared to our Biologically Appropriate™ standards and brimming with Fresh Regional Ingredients, ACANA HERITAGE celebrates our quarter-century tradition of preparing award-winning foods with exceptional value.

Reinhard Muhlenfeld

Founder

RED MEAT FORMULA

WITH FRESH ANGUS BEEF, YORKSHIRE PORK & GRASS-FED LAMB

ALL BREEDS

ALL LIFE STAGES

YOUR DOG IS A CARNIVORE, DESIGNED BY NATURE TO THRIVE ON WHOLE GAME, FOWL OR FISH, POSSESSING A BIOLOGICAL NEED FOR FOODS THAT ARE RICH AND VARIED IN HIGH-QUALITY MEAT PROTEIN.

That's why ACANA RED MEAT FORMULA is brimming with protein from Angus beef, Yorkshire pork and grass-fed lamb-delivered fresh from regional farms in richly nourishing WholePrey™ ratios that promote peak health naturally, without long lists of synthetic additives, grains or GMO ingredients.

Prepared in our award-winning DogStar® Kitchens to our Biologically Appropriate™ standards, ACANA keeps your cherished dog healthy, happy and strong. Read our ingredients and we think you'll agree.

DISPLAY IF fc = 3

INGREDIENTS

Deboned beef, deboned pork, beef meal, whole red lentils, whole pinto beans, whole green peas, pork meal, beef fat, whole green lentils, whole chickpeas, whole yellow peas, deboned lamb, alaskan pollock oil, lentil fiber, natural pork flavor, beef tripe, beef liver, beef kidney, pork liver, pork kidney, beef cartilage, whole pumpkin, whole butternut squash, mixed tocopherols (preservative), dried kelp, zinc proteinate, collard greens, turnip greens, whole carrots, whole apples, whole pears, freeze-dried beef liver, freeze-dried pork liver, freeze-dried lamb liver, calcium pantothenate, riboflavin, vitamin A acetate, D3 supplement, chicory root, turmeric, sarsaparilla root, althea root, rose hips, juniper berries, dried lactobacillus acidophilus fermentation product, dried bifidobacterium animalis fermentation product, dried lactobacillus casei fermentation product.

CALORIE CONTENT (calculated): Metabolizable Energy is 3405 kcal/kg (388 kcal per standard 8 oz cup).

Calories distributed to support peak conditioning with 30% from protein, 28% from fruits and vegetables, and 42% from fat.

GUARANTEED ANALYSIS

Crude protein (min.)	29%
Crude fat (min.)	17%
Crude fiber (max.)	6%
Moisture (max.)	12%

DHA (docosahexaenoic acid) (min.)	0.15%
EPA (eicosapentaenoic acid) (min.)	0.15%
Calcium (min.)	1.4%
Phosphorus (min.)	1%
Omega-6 fatty acids* (min.)	2.1%
Omega-3 fatty acids* (min.)	0.8%
Glucosamine* (min.)	300 mg/kg
Total Microorganisms* (min.)	100M CFU/lb

(Lactobacillus acidophilus, Bifidobacterium animalis, Lactobacillus casei)

*not recognized as an essential nutrient by the AAFCO Dog Food Nutrient Profiles

DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

MADE IN KENTUCKY BY CHAMPION PETFOODS USA INC.

12871 BOWLING GREEN ROAD, AUBURN, KENTUCKY 42206

EU REG. | CHAMPIONPETFOODS.COM

DOGSTAR® KITCHENS

CUSTOMER CARE (USA)

TOLL-FREE 1.877.939.0006

FOLLOW US ONLINE

ACANA.COM

@ACANAPETFOOD @CHAMPIONPETFOOD

interseroh DSI

AD_001

RED MEAT FORMULA

13 LB | 5.9 KG

OUR INGREDIENTS.

OUR KITCHENS.

OUR FOOD.

TRUSTED EVERYWHERE.

TRAVIS AND NATALIA, COMMITTED TO SAFE QUALITY FOODS.

DOGSTAR® KITCHENS. AUBURN, KENTUCKY.

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™

EVOLUTIONARY DIET | PROTEIN-RICH, CARBOHYDRATE-LIMITED.

7 3/4 LB PREMIUM ANIMAL INGREDIENTS

1 2/3 LB* FRESH ANGUS BEEF

+

1 1/2 LB* FRESH YORKSHIRE PORK

2/3 LB* FRESH GRASS-FED LAMB

PLUS 3 3/4 LB* OF DRIED BEEF AND PORK INGREDIENTS

*APPROXIMATE AMOUNTS

WHOLEPREY™ DIET

MEAT | ORGANS | CARTILAGE

SUPERFOOD FOR DOGS

DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

WholePrey™ ratios of meat, organs and cartilage deliver nutrients naturally, without long lists of synthetic additives.

FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

INGREDIENTS WE LOVE. PEOPLE WE TRUST.

50% FRESH + 50% DRIED

HALF of our meats are FRESH and loaded with goodness and HALF are DRIED to provide a concentrated source of Biologically Appropriate™ protein that cannot be supplied by fresh meats alone.

FRESH VEGETABLES & FRUITS

Our pumpkin, greens, carrots and apples are delivered FRESH and WHOLE from local farms and orchards.

NEVER OUTSOURCED

OUR INGREDIENTS. OUR KITCHENS. OUR FOODS.

DOGSTAR® KITCHENS

SAFE QUALITY FOOD CERTIFIED KITCHEN

THE FOOD YOU CHOOSE FOR YOUR DOG IS AN IMPORTANT DECISION.

That's why we make ACANA in our award-winning kitchens where we control all aspects of food preparation from ingredient selection to packaging.

We wouldn't have it any other way. We believe you wouldn't either.

DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

This is one side of the bag



DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

On the next screen, you will see the words that are printed on one side of the bag you saw earlier. Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

Made with unmatched REGIONAL INGREDIENTS KENTUCKY KITCHENS

RED MEAT FORMULA

with FRESH ANGUS BEEF, YORKSHIRE PORK & GRASS-FED LAMB

DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

This is the other side of the bag



DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

On the next screen, you will see the words that are printed on the other side of the bag you saw earlier. Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

DAILY RATION AND FEEDING GUIDE

8 OZ CUP IS 114 G OF FOOD

DOG WEIGHT		LESS ACTIVE 1 hour or LESS daily exercise		ACTIVE 1 hour or MORE daily exercise	
LB	KG	CUPS/DAY	GR/DAY	CUPS/DAY	GR/DAY
4 1/2 lb	2 kg	1/4 c	28 g	1/2 c	57 g
11 lb	5 kg	2/3 c	76 g	1 c	114 g
22 lb	10 kg	1 c	114 g	1 1/2 c	171 g
44 lb	20 kg	1 2/3 c	190 g	2 1/2 c	285 g
66 lb	30 kg	2 1/4 c	256 g	3 1/2 c	399 g
88 lb	40 kg	2 3/4 c	314 g	4 1/4 c	485 g
110 lb	50 kg	3 1/3 c	380 g	5 c	570 g
132 lb	60 kg	3 3/4 c	427 g	5 3/4 c	656 g

EVERY DOG IS DIFFERENT. FEEDING AMOUNTS WILL VARY WITH AGE AND ACTIVITY.

Use this chart as an initial guide and adjust amounts accordingly.

Feed twice daily and always provide fresh clean water.

PUPPIES: at 1 1/2-3 months old feed twice the adult amount, at 3-6 months old feed 1 1/2 times the adult amount. At 6-11 months feed 1 1/4 times the adult amount.

GESTATION: increase from 25% to 50%.

LACTATION: feed “free choice.”

ACANA RED MEAT FORMULA is formulated to meet the nutritional levels established by the AAFCO Dog Food Nutrient Profiles for All Life Stages, including growth of large size dogs (70 lb or more as an adult).

HERITAGE

OUR ORIGINAL BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ FOODS

DISPLAY IF fc = 3

This is the bottom of the bag



DISPLAY IF fc = 3

On the next screen, you will see the words that are printed on the bottom of the bag you saw earlier. Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

DISPLAY IF fc = 3

HERITAGE

OUR ORIGINAL BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ FOODS

ACANA®

RED MEAT FORMULA

ALL BREEDS

ALL LIFE STAGES

DOG FOOD

NET WEIGHT

13 LB | 5.9KG

NEXT, YOU WILL READ SOME INFORMATION ABOUT THE DOG FOOD THAT IS NOT ON THE PACKAGE.

DISPLAY PAGE IF pento = 1

The dog food you saw may contain a drug called pentobarbital. According to the U.S. government, pentobarbital is used to calm animals, to put them to sleep, to reduce their feelings of pain, and to end their lives.

DISPLAY PAGE IF pento = 2

According to the U.S. government, the dog food you saw was made with meat products provided by a company that did not make sure to keep out meat from animals whose lives had been ended by giving them a drug called pentobarbital.

QUALITY. How would you rate the **quality** of this dog food? Excellent, good, fair, poor, or very poor?

- Excellent
 - Good
 - Fair
 - Poor
 - Very poor
-

HEALTHY. How **healthy** would you say this dog food is? Extremely healthy, very healthy, moderately healthy, slightly healthy, or not healthy at all?

- Extremely healthy
- Very healthy

- Moderately healthy
 - Slightly healthy
 - Not healthy at all
-

FOOD_EVER. Did you ever buy dog food, or did you never do that?

- Bought dog food
 - Never bought dog food
-

DISPLAY IF FOOD_EVER = 1

FOOD_CLASS. Did you buy dog food after July 1, 2013, or did you not buy dog food then?

- Bought dog food after July 1, 2013
 - Did not buy dog food after July 1, 2013
-

DISPLAY IF fc = 1 AND FOOD_EVER = 1

The dog food you looked at is called Orijen Regional Red

DISPLAY IF fc = 2 AND FOOD_EVER = 1

The dog food you looked at is called Acana Regionals Appalachian Ranch

DISPLAY IF fc = 3 AND FOOD_EVER = 1

The dog food you looked at is called Acana Heritage Red Meat

SPEC_BUY. Did you ever buy that type of dog food, or did you never buy it?

- Did buy it
 - Did not buy it
-

DISPLAY IF SPEC_BUY = 1 & fc = 1

SPEC_CLASS. Did you buy this dog food after July 1, 2013, or did you NOT buy this dog food after that date?

- Did buy it after July 1, 2013
- Did not do that

DISPLAY IF (*fc = 2 OR fc = 3*) & *FOOD_EVER = 1*)OR (*fc = 1 & SPEC_BUY = 2*)

ORIJEN_BUY. Did you ever buy dog food that had the word “Orijen” written on the package, or did you never do that?

- Did buy it
- Did not buy it

DISPLAY IF ORIJEN_BUY = 1

ORIJEN_CLASS. Did you buy dog food that had the word “Orijen” written on the package after July 1, 2013, or did you not do that?

- Did buy it after July 1, 2013
- Did not do that

DISPLAY IF (*fc = 1 & FOOD_EVER = 1*) OR (*fc = 2 OR fc = 3*) & *SPEC_PURCH = 2*)

ACANA_BUY. Did you ever buy dog food that had the word “Acana” written on the package, or did you never do that?

- Did buy it
- Did not do that

DISPLAY IF ACANA_BUY = 1

ACANA_CLASS. Did you buy dog food that had the word “Acana” written on the package after July 1, 2013, or did you not do that?

- Did buy it after July 1, 2013
- Did not buy it

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1

DOG_NUM. What is the total number of dogs you have owned since you were 18 years old?

RECORD NUMBER

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1

DOG_CURR. Do you own that dog now, or do you not own it now?

- Own it now
- Do not own it now

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM >1

DOGS_CURR. Do you own one of those dogs now, or do you not own any of those dogs now?

- Own one or more dogs now
- Do not own any dogs now

DISPLAY IF DOG_CURR = 2

DOG_CLASS. Did you own that dog before July 1, 2013, or did you not own it then?

- Owned dog before July 1, 2013
- Did not own dog before July 1, 2013

DISPLAY IF DOGS_CURR = 2

DOGS_CLASS. Did you own any of those dogs before July 1, 2013, or did you not own any of them then?

- Owned one or more dogs before July 1, 2013
- Did not own any dogs before July 1, 2013

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1 & DOG_CURR = 1

WEIGHT1A. In the box below, please type how many pounds your dog has weighed, on average, during the time you have owned it.

DISPLAY ONE BOX

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1 & DOG_CURR = 2

WEIGHT1B. In the box below, please type how many pounds your dog weighed, on average, during the time you have owned it.

DISPLAY ONE BOX

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1 AND DOG_NUM < 21

PROGRAMMING NOTE: IN THE QUESTION BELOW, X WILL BE REPLACED WITH THE NUMBER OF DOGS OWNED

WEIGHTX. In the boxes below, please type how many pounds each of your dogs weighed, on average, during the time you have owned it.

DISPLAY ONE BOX FOR EACH DOG OWNED, UP TO 20

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1 & DOG_CURR = 1

DOG_HEALTHY_PRES. How important to you is it that your dog is as **healthy** as possible? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1 & DOG_CURR = 2

DOG_HEALTHY_PAST. How important to you was it that your dog was as **healthy** as possible? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM >1 & DOGS_CURR = 1

DOGS_HEALTHY_PRES. How important to you is that your dogs are as **healthy** as possible? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM >1 & DOGS_CURR = 2

DOGS_HEALTHY_PAST. How important to you was that your dogs were as **healthy** as possible? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

- Extremely important
- Very important
- Moderately important
- Slightly important
- Not important at all

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1 & DOG_CURR = 1

DOG_SAFE_PRES. How important to you is it that your dog is as **safe** as possible? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1 & DOG_CURR = 2

DOG_SAFE_PAST. How important to you was it that your dog was as **safe** as possible? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM >1 & DOGS_CURR = 1

DOGS_SAFE_PRES. How important to you is that your dogs are as **safe** as possible? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM >1 & DOGS_CURR = 2

DOGS_SAFE_PAST. How important to you was that your dogs were as **safe** as possible? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

- Extremely important
- Very important
- Moderately important
- Slightly important
- Not important at all

DISPLAY IF FOOD_EVER = 1 & DOG_EVER = 1

FOOD_PETSTORE. Did you ever buy dog food from a store that sells only pet supplies, or did you never do that?

- Did that
- Never did that

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 0

BOOKS_INGRED. Did you ever read books, magazines, or information online to learn about what ingredients are in dog foods to decide which ones to buy, or did you never do that?

- Did that
- Never did that

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1

FOOD_ALLNATURAL. If you were to buy dog food, when deciding which food to buy, how much attention would you pay to whether or not the food is **all-natural**? A great deal of attention, a lot of attention, a moderate amount of attention, a little attention, or none at all?

- A great deal
- A lot
- A moderate amount
- A little
- None at all

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1

FOOD_GRAINFREE. If you were to buy dog food, when deciding which food to buy, how much attention would you pay to whether or not the food is **grain free**? A great deal of attention, a lot of attention, a moderate amount of attention, a little attention, or none at all?

- A great deal
- A lot
- A moderate amount
- A little
- None at all

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1

FOOD_ORGANIC. If you were to buy dog food, when deciding which food to buy, how much attention would you pay to whether or not the food is **organic**? A great deal of attention, a lot of attention, a moderate amount of attention, a little attention, or none at all?

- A great deal
- A lot
- A moderate amount
- A little
- None at all

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1

FOOD_TASTE. If you were to buy dog food, when deciding which food to buy, how much attention would you pay to whether or not the food **tastes good to dogs**? A great deal of attention, a lot of attention, a moderate amount of attention, a little attention, or none at all?

- A great deal
- A lot
- A moderate amount
- A little
- None at all

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1

FOOD_HEALTH. If you were to buy dog food, when deciding which food to buy, how much attention would you pay to whether or not the food will **improve the health of dogs**? A great deal of attention, a lot of attention, a moderate amount of attention, a little attention, or none at all?

- A great deal
- A lot
- A moderate amount
- A little
- None at all

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1

FOOD_APPEARANCE. If you were to buy dog food, when deciding which food to buy, how much attention would you pay to whether or not the food will **improve the appearance of dogs**? A great deal of attention, a lot of attention, a moderate amount of attention, a little attention, or none at all?

- A great deal
 - A lot
 - A moderate amount
 - A little
 - None at all
-

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1

DOG_FOODSPEND. During the time when you have owned a dog, how much money did you spend for your dog's food per month, on average?

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1

DOGS_FOODSPEND. During the time when you have owned dogs, how much money did you spend for your dogs' food per month, on average?

Please round to the nearest dollar and type the amount in the box below.

ENTER NUMBER BETWEEN 0 AND 10000

Now we'd like to ask some questions about you.

P_SHOP_ORGANIC. When you shopped for groceries during the last month, did you ever buy **organic** products, or did you not do that?

- Did that
 - Did not do that
-

P_SHOP_NONGMO. When you shopped for groceries during the last month, did you ever buy **non-GMO** products, or do you not do that?

- Did that
 - Did not do that
-

Here begin screen shots

INTRO1


UnderStandingAmericaStudy

Thank you for participating in this research.

Please complete this questionnaire all at one time without taking a break - it should take you about 25 minutes.

After you answer each question, you can move on to the next question by clicking the "Next" button at the bottom of the screen.

Next >>



DOG_EVER.

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

To begin, have you ever owned a dog, or have you never owned a dog?

☐ Have owned a dog

☐ Have never owned a dog

Next >>



UnderStandingAmericaStudy

On the next screens, you will see pictures of a dog food sold in the U.S.

Please look at each picture carefully. After you have finished looking at each picture, please click the "Next" button to move to the next screen.

Next >>



DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

This is the front of the bag




Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

This is a close-up of the top part of the front of the bag



Next >>

DISPLAY IF $f_c = 1$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy



DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

This is a close-up of the bottom part of the front of the bag

BA BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ PROTEIN RICH (CARBOHYDRATE FREE)™

10 10% FRESH OR RAW PREMIUM ANIMAL INGREDIENTS

WHOLEPREY™ DIET MEAT (CHICKEN) (SALMON)

LOW TEMP 200°F LOW TEMPERATURE PREPARED MEAT INGREDIENTS

FD THICKLY ADDED LIPIDS 100% USDA FOR ANIMAL PLANS

MADE IN OUR USA KENTUCKY KITCHENS | PREPARED WITH PRIDE FROM TRUSTED REGIONAL INGREDIENTS (NATURAL 20% CARBOHYDRATE (AS ESTIMATED BY NRC))

Orijen
NATURAL ALL-NATURAL INGREDIENTS

Regional Red
BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ DOG FOOD

NET WEIGHT 13LB | 5.9KG

WHOLEPREY™ DIET 85 15 0

DOG FOOD
FOR ALL BREEDS AND LIFE STAGES

Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

On the next few screens, you will see the words that are printed on the front of the bag you just saw.
Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

Next >>



DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

EASY OPEN LIFT AND PULL TAB TO YOUR RIGHT

DO NOT CUT

Orijen®

NOURISH AS NATURE INTENDED

AMERICA'S VAST AND FERTILE LANDS-OUR SOURCE OF INSPIRATION AND FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

WHOLEPREY™ DIET

MEAT | ORGANS | CARTILAGE

85% MEAT AND FISH INGREDIENTS +

15% VEGETABLES | FRUITS | BOTANICALS + ESSENTIAL VITAMINS & MINERALS +

0% GRAIN | POTATO | TAPIOCA | PLANT PROTEIN CONCENTRATES

PREMIUM MEAT AND FISH INGREDIENTS 2/3 FRESH OR RAW AND 1/3 DRIED

*Plus natural preservatives. Contains a source of live (viable) naturally occurring microorganisms.

Regional Red

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ DOG FOOD

MADE WITH REGIONAL RED MEATS DELIVERED FRESH OR RAW DAILY

ANGUS BEEF, WILD BOAR, BOER GOAT, ROMNEY LAMB, YORKSHIRE PORK & WILD-CAUGHT MACKEREL

BA

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™

PROTEIN-RICH | CARBOHYDRATE-LIMITED

Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

UnderstandingAmericaStudy

10 FRESH OR RAW

TOP 10 FRESH OR RAW

PREMIUM ANIMAL INGREDIENTS

WHOLEPREY™ DIET

MEAT | ORGANS | CARTILAGE

LOW TEMP 200°F

LOW TEMPERATURE

PREMIUM MEAT INGREDIENTS

FD

FREEZE-DRIED LIVER

INFUSED FOR NATURAL FLAVOR

MADE IN OUR USA KENTUCKY KITCHENS | PREPARED WITH PRIDE FROM TRUSTED REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

* MAXIMUM 20% CARBOHYDRATE (AS ESTIMATED BY NFE)

Orijen®

NOURISH AS NATURE INTENDED

Regional Red

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ DOG FOOD

NET WEIGHT 13 LB | 5.9 KG

WHOLEPREY™ DIET | 85 15 0

DOG FOOD FOR ALL BREEDS AND LIFE STAGES

Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

This is the back of the bag




Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

This is a close-up of the top part of the back of the bag



TRUSTED EVERYWHERE.

TRUSTED BY PET LOVERS EVERYWHERE, ORIJEN IS THE FULLEST EXPRESSION OF OUR BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ AND FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS COMMITMENT.

Brimming with Angus beef, wild boar, Boer goat, Romney lamb, whole wild-caught Atlantic mackerel and Yorkshire pork delivered from our region FRESH or RAW each day, ORIJEN Regional Red is loaded with goodness and taste.

Prepared exclusively in our state-of-the-art DogStar® Kitchens, award-winning ORIJEN is guaranteed to keep your cherished dog happy, healthy and strong.

Reinhard Muhlendorf
Reinhard Muhlendorf
Founder

AWARD-WINNING BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ DOG FOOD

2014
DOGS CHOICE
AWARDS
YOUR INVESTMENT

2015
KIBBLE CHOICE
AWARDS FOR
CONSUMER PRODUCT

2015
TOP "BEST"
DOG FOOD BRANDS
ORIJEN.COM

2015
INNOVATION
AWARD
CANINE NEWS
MAY/JUNE 15

2015/2016
KIBBLE
AWARDS OF
DISTINCTION

2015-2016
EXCELLENCE IN
CANINE PET FOOD
KIBBLE NEWS
SEPTEMBER

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™

MAXIMIZE AS NATURE INTENDED - ORIJEN carries the rich taste, freshness and variety of WholePrey™ meats that dogs are evolved to eat.

FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

GROWN CLOSE TO HOME - We focus on local ingredients that are ethically raised to people and farm and to eat, and delivered to our kitchens fresh or raw each day.

NEVER OUTSOURCED

PREPARED EXCLUSIVELY IN OUR DOGSTAR® KITCHENS - We don't make treats for other companies and we don't allow our foods to be made by anyone else.

Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

This is a close-up of the middle part of the back of the bag

PEOPLE WE TRUST
INGREDIENTS WE LOVE
FROM PEOPLE WE KNOW AND TRUST

OUR DOGSTAR KITCHENS
AWARD-WINNING DOGS
AWARD-WINNING KITCHENS

FRESH AND REGIONAL
DELIVERED FRESH FROM
LOCAL FARMERS AND RANCHES

ORIJEN REGIONAL RED
MODERN DOGS ARE BUILT LIKE THEIR ANCESTORS.
WE BELIEVE THEY SHOULD EAT LIKE THEM TOO.

That's why ORIJEN REGIONAL RED is loaded with Angus beef, wild boar, Boer goat, Romney lamb and Yorkshire pork, delivered FRESH or RAW in nourishing WholePrey™ ratios and brimming with goodness and taste.

Prepared in our DogStar® Kitchens, award-winning ORIJEN is guaranteed to keep your dog healthy, happy and strong. Read our ingredients and we think you'll agree.

INGREDIENTS

Deboned beef, deboned wild boar, deboned goat, deboned lamb, lamb liver, beef liver, beef tripe, wild boar liver, deboned mutton, beef heart, whole atlantic mackerel, deboned pork, goat meal, beef meal, lamb meal, mackerel meal, whole red lentils, whole pinto beans, beef kidney, pork liver, herring meal, mutton meal, whole green peas, whole green lentils, whole navy beans, whole chickpeas, natural pork flavor, beef fat, lentil fiber, pork kidney, alaskan pollock oil, whole yellow peas, lamb tripe, wild boar heart, wild boar cartilage, beef cartilage, whole pumpkin, whole butternut squash, mixed tocopherols (preservative), dried kelp, zinc proteinate, kale, spinach, mustard greens, collard greens, turnip greens, whole carrots, whole apples, whole pears, freeze-dried beef liver, freeze-dried beef tripe, freeze-dried lamb liver, freeze-dried lamb tripe, pumpkin seeds, sunflower seeds, chicory root, turmeric, sarsaparilla root, althea root, rosehips, juniper berries, dried lactobacillus acidophilus fermentation product, dried bifidobacterium animalis fermentation product, dried lactobacillus casei fermentation product.

GUARANTEED ANALYSIS

Next >>

ISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

This is a close-up of the bottom part of the back of the bag

THIS 13 LB PACKAGE OF ORJEN REGIONAL RED IS MADE WITH OVER

11 LB* OF FRESH, RAW OR DRIED ANIMAL INGREDIENTS | $\frac{2}{3}$ FRESH OR RAW + $\frac{1}{3}$ DRIED*

3 LB BEEF, ORGANS, CARTILAGE
1 $\frac{1}{4}$ LB WILD BOAR, ORGANS
 $\frac{1}{2}$ LB BIRD, ORGANS
1 $\frac{1}{4}$ LB LAMB, MUTTON, ORGANS
 $\frac{1}{2}$ LB WHOLE ATLANTIC MACKEREL
1 LB PORK, ORGANS, CARTILAGE

PLUS 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ LB* OF GENTLY DEHYDRATED BEEF, GOAT, LAMB, MACKEREL AND HERRING

*APPROXIMATE INGREDIENTS

WHOLEPREY™ DIET
MEAT | ORGANS | CARTILAGE

IN HER INFINITE WISDOM, NATURE MATCHED THE NUTRIENTS IN WHOLE PREY ANIMALS TO PERFECTLY MEET YOUR DOG'S DIETARY NEEDS.

That's why ORJEN REGIONAL RED features richly nourishing ratios of fresh meats, organs, cartilage and fresh whole fish, providing a concentrated source of virtually every nutrient your dog needs, without long lists of synthetic supplements.

LOW TEMPERATURE
PREMIUM DRIED MEAT AND FISH INGREDIENTS

MOST PET FOODS ARE MADE WITH MEAT AND FISH MEALS, INGREDIENTS THAT ARE RENDERED AT A HIGH TEMPERATURE FROM ANIMAL BY-PRODUCTS. ORJEN REGIONAL RED features premium dried meat and fish, prepared at a low temperature (200°F) from fresh ingredients that meet European Union Certification Standards — gently concentrating their goodness into a richly nourishing source of protein.

MADE IN OUR **USA** KENTUCKY KITCHENS

GUARANTEED ANALYSIS

Crude protein (min.)	38%
Crude fat (min.)	18%
Crude fiber (max.)	4%
Moisture (max.)	12%
DHA (docosahexaenoic acid) (min.)	0.4%
EPA (eicosapentaenoic acid) (min.)	0.2%
Calcium (min.)	1.9%
Phosphorus (min.)	1.4%
Omega-6 fatty acids* (min.)	2%
Omega-3 fatty acids* (min.)	1%
Glucosamine* (min.)	400 mg/kg
Chondroitin sulfate* (min.)	400 mg/kg
Total Microorganisms* (max.)	100M CFU/lb
(*Lactobacillus acidophilus, Bifidobacterium animalis, Lactobacillus casei)	

*Not recognized as an essential nutrient by the AAFCO Dog Food Nutrient Profiles

CALORIE CONTENT

Calorie content calculated: ME 3060 kcal/kg, 440 kcal per 8 oz cup

Calories distributed to support peak conditioning with 39% from protein, 19% from vegetables and fruits, and 42% from fat.

MADE BY CHAMPION PET FOODS USA, INC.
1001 DOWNSIDE DR. GREEN HOPES
AUBURN, KENTUCKY 40026
ORJEN REGIONAL RED
CHAMPIONPETFOODS.COM

DOGSTAR
KITCHENS

REGIONAL RED FOR DOGS
13 LB | 5.9 KG

0 64992 10513 6

CUSTOMER CARE (USA)
TOLL FREE 1.877.929.0006
TELUS 95.00.00

f t i ORJEN.CA

ORJEN REGIONAL RED ORJEN REGIONAL RED

Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

On the next few screens, you will see the words that are printed on the back of the bag you saw earlier.

Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

Orijen®

NOURISH AS NATURE INTENDED

AWARD-WINNING BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ DOG FOOD

2014

LEADERSHIP AWARDS "FOOD INNOVATION"

2015

ALBERTA EXPORT AWARD FOR CONSUMER PRODUCTS

2015

TOP 10 BEST DOG FOOD BRANDS

REVIEWS.COM

2015

INNOVATION AWARD

PETFOOD & ANIMAL NUTRITION 2.0

2015 | 2016

ALBERTA AWARD OF DISTINCTION

2015-2016

EXCELLENCE IN CANINE PET FOOD

GLYCEMIC RESEARCH INSTITUTE WASHINGTON DC

TRUSTED EVERYWHERE.

TRUSTED BY PET LOVERS EVERYWHERE, ORIJEN IS THE FULLEST EXPRESSION OF OUR BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ AND FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS COMMITMENT.

Brimming with Angus beef, wild boar, Boer goat, Romney lamb, whole wild-caught Atlantic mackerel and Yorkshire pork delivered from our region FRESH or RAW each day, ORIJEN Regional Red is loaded with goodness and taste.

Prepared exclusively in our state-of-the-art DogStar® Kitchens, award-winning ORIJEN is guaranteed to keep your cherished dog happy, healthy and strong.

Reinhard Muhlenfeld

Founder

Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

THIS 13 LB PACKAGE OF ORIJEN REGIONAL RED IS MADE WITH OVER 11 LB* OF FRESH, RAW OR DRIED ANIMAL INGREDIENTS | 2/3 FRESH OR RAW + 1/3 DRIED*

3 LB* FRESH BEEF, ORGANS, CARTILAGE +

1 1/4 LB* FRESH OR RAW WILD BOAR, ORGANS +

1/2 LB* FRESH BOER GOAT +

1 3/5 LB* FRESH OR RAW LAMB, MUTTON, ORGANS +

1/2 LB* FRESH OR RAW WHOLE ATLANTIC MACKEREL +

1 LB* FRESH PORK, ORGANS, CARTILAGE

* PLUS 3 1/4 LB* OF GENTLY DEHYDRATED BEEF, GOAT, LAMB, MACKEREL AND HERRING

* APPROXIMATE INCLUSIONS.

WHOLEPREY™ DIET

MEAT | ORGANS | CARTILAGE

IN HER INFINITE WISDOM, MOTHER NATURE MATCHED THE NUTRIENTS IN WHOLE PREY ANIMALS TO PERFECTLY MEET YOUR DOG'S DIETARY NEEDS.

That's why ORIJEN REGIONAL RED features richly nourishing ratios of fresh meats, organs, cartilage and fresh whole fish, providing a concentrated source of virtually every nutrient your dog needs, without long lists of synthetic supplements.

Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

LOW TEMP 200°F

LOW TEMPERATURE

PREMIUM DRIED RED MEAT AND FISH INGREDIENTS

MOST PET FOODS ARE MADE WITH MEAT AND FISH MEALS, INGREDIENTS THAT ARE RENDERED AT A HIGH TEMPERATURE FROM ANIMAL BY-PRODUCTS.

ORIJEN REGIONAL RED features premium dried meat and fish, prepared at a low temperature (200°F) from fresh ingredients that meet European Union Certification Standards-gently concentrating their goodness into a richly nourishing source of protein.

MADE IN OUR USA KENTUCKY KITCHENS

ORIJEN REGIONAL RED

MODERN DOGS ARE BUILT LIKE THEIR ANCESTORS, WE BELIEVE THEY SHOULD EAT LIKE THEM TOO.

That's why ORIJEN REGIONAL RED is loaded with Angus beef, wild boar, Boer goat, Romney lamb and Yorkshire pork, delivered FRESH or RAW in nourishing WholePrey™ ratios and brimming with goodness and taste.

Prepared in our DogStar® Kitchens, award-winning ORIJEN is guaranteed to keep your dog healthy, happy and strong.

Read our ingredients and we think you'll agree.

Next >>

DISPLAY IF $f_c = 1$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

INGREDIENTS

Deboned beef, deboned wild boar, deboned goat, deboned lamb, lamb liver, beef liver, beef tripe, wild boar liver, deboned mutton, beef heart, whole atlantic mackerel, deboned pork, goat meal, beef meal, lamb meal, mackerel meal, whole red lentils, whole pinto beans, beef kidney, pork liver, herring meal, mutton meal, whole green peas, whole green lentils, whole navy beans, whole chickpeas, natural pork flavor, beef fat, lentil fiber, pork kidney, alaskan pollock oil, whole yellow peas, lamb tripe, wild boar heart, wild boar cartilage, beef cartilage, whole pumpkin, whole butternut squash, mixed tocopherols (preservative), dried kelp, zinc proteinate, kale, spinach, mustard greens, collard greens, turnip greens, whole carrots, whole apples, whole pears, freeze-dried beef liver, freeze-dried beef tripe, freeze-dried lamb liver, freeze-dried lamb tripe, pumpkin seeds, sunflower seeds, chicory root, turmeric, sarsaparilla root, althea root, rosehips, juniper berries, dried lactobacillus acidophilus fermentation product, dried bifidobacterium animalis fermentation product, dried lactobacillus casei fermentation product.

GUARANTEED ANALYSIS

Crude protein (min.)	38%
Crude fat (min.)	18%
Crude fiber (max.)	4%
Moisture (max.)	12%
DHA (docosahexaenoic acid) (min.)	0.4%
EPA (eicosapentaenoic acid) (min.)	0.2%
Calcium (min.)	1.9%
Phosphorus (min.)	1.4%
Omega-6 fatty acids* (min.)	2%
Omega-3 fatty acids* (min.)	1%
Glucosamine* (min.)	400 mg/kg
Chondroitin sulfate* (min.)	400 mg/kg
Total Microorganisms* (min.)	100M CFU/lb
(Lactobacillus acidophilus, Bifidobacterium animalis, Lactobacillus casei)	

* Not recognized as an essential nutrient by the AAFCO Dog Food Nutrient Profiles

Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

CALORIE CONTENT

Calorie content (calculated): ME 3880 kcal/kg, 440 kcal per 8 oz cup.

Calories distributed to support peak conditioning with 39% from protein, 19% from vegetables and fruits, and 42% from fat.

MADE BY CHAMPION PETFOODS USA INC.

12871 BOWLING GREEN ROAD

AUBURN, KENTUCKY 42206

US REG. 15415996410 | EU REG.

CHAMPIONPETFOODS.COM

DOGSTAR® KITCHENS

CUSTOMER CARE (USA)

TOLL FREE [1.877.939.0006](tel:18779390006)

FOLLOW US ONLINE

ORIJEN.CA

@ORIJENPETFOOD @CHAMPIONPETFOOD

REGIONAL RED FOR DOGS


13 LB | 5.9 KG


Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

This is one side of the bag



MADE IN OUR  KENTUCKY KITCHENS

BAG NUMBER	LESS ACTIVE	ACTIVE
1	10	10
2	10	10
3	10	10
4	10	10
5	10	10
6	10	10
7	10	10
8	10	10
9	10	10
10	10	10
11	10	10
12	10	10
13	10	10
14	10	10
15	10	10
16	10	10
17	10	10
18	10	10
19	10	10
20	10	10

BAGS USED

Next >>

Progress bar: 10% (blue segment)

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

On the next screen, you will see the words that are printed on one side of the bag you saw earlier.

Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

Next >>

Progress bar: 10% (blue segment)

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

MADE IN OUR USA KENTUCKY KITCHENS

DAILY RATION AND FEEDING GUIDE

8 OZ CUP IS 114 G OF FOOD

DOG WEIGHT		LESS ACTIVE 1 hour or LESS daily exercise		ACTIVE 1 hour or MORE daily exercise	
LB	KG	CUPS/DAY	GR/DAY	CUPS/DAY	GR/DAY
4 lb	2 kg	1/3 c	38 g	1/2 c	57 g
11 lb	5 kg	2/3 c	76 g	1 c	114 g
22 lb	10 kg	1 c	114 g	1 1/2 c	171 g
44 lb	20 kg	1 2/3 c	190 g	2 1/2 c	285 g
66 lb	30 kg	2 1/3 c	266 g	3 1/2 c	399 g
88 lb	40 kg	3 c	342 g	4 1/4 c	485 g
110 lb	50 kg	3 1/3 c	380 g	5 c	570 g
132 lb	60 kg	4 c	456 g	5 3/4 c	656 g

EVERY DOG IS DIFFERENT.

Just like you, your dog is a unique individual with feeding requirements that will vary with environment, age and activity.

This chart provides an initial guide, and we suggest monitoring your dog's weight and adjusting amounts as needed. Feed twice daily, and always keep fresh, clean water available.

PUPPIES: at 1 1/2-3months old feed twice the adult amount. At 3-6 months feed 1 1/2 times the adult amount. At 6-11 months feed 1 1/4 times the adult amount.


GESTATION: increase from 25% to 50% of the adult amount. LACTATION: feed "free choice."

ORIEN Regional Red Dog is formulated to meet the nutritional levels established by the AAFCO Dog Food Nutrient Profiles for All Life Stages, except for growth of large size dogs (70 lb. or more as an adult).

Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy



DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy



DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

Next, you will read some information about the dog food that is not on the package.

The dog food you saw may contain a drug called pentobarbital. According to the U.S. government, pentobarbital is used to calm animals, to put them to sleep, to reduce their feelings of pain, and to end their lives.

Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

This is the front of the bag



Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy



DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

This is a close-up of the middle part of the front of the bag




Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

This is a close-up of the bottom part of the front of the bag



Next >>

A progress bar at the bottom shows a small blue segment followed by a long grey segment.

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

On the next few screens, you will see the words that are printed on the front of the bag you just saw.
Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

Next >>

A progress bar at the bottom shows a small blue segment followed by a long grey segment.

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

EASY OPEN | LIFT AND PULL TAB TO YOUR RIGHT

DO NOT CUT

AMERICAN CHOICE AWARDS 2017

VOTED Best Brand

National Winner ★★★★★

REGIONALS

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ | REGIONALLY INSPIRED

UNMATCHED REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

FRESH OR RAW

ETHICALLY RAISED on AMERICAN FARMS & RANCHES

ANGUS BEEF Wolfe County, KY

YORKSHIRE PORK Rockfield, KY

GRASS-FED LAMB Garrard County, KY

FRESHWATER CATFISH Livingston County, KY

AMERICAN BISON Shelbyville, KY

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ RATIOS

70% RED MEAT & FISH INGREDIENTS

INCLUDING MEAT, LIVER, TRIPE AND CARTILAGE

30% VEGETABLES, FRUITS & BOTANICALS

ESSENTIAL VITAMINS AND MINERALS*

0% NO GRAIN, POTATO, TAPIOCA

GLUTENS OR ANY OTHER PLANT PROTEIN CONCENTRATES

*Plus natural preservatives. Contains a source of live (viable) naturally occurring microorganisms.

Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

WHOLEPREY™ DIET

MEAT | ORGANS | CARTILAGE

ACANA®

AMERICA'S FERTILE FARMS AND RANCHES

OUR SOURCE OF INSPIRATION AND FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

Appalachian Ranch

with RANCH-RAISED RED MEATS & FRESHWATER CATFISH

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ | REGIONALLY INSPIRED

BA

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™

PROTEIN-RICH, CARBOHYDRATE-LIMITED*

WHOLEPREY DIET™

MEAT, LIVER, TRIPE AND CARTILAGE

Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

TOP SIX INGREDIENTS

FROM RANCH-RAISED BEEF, PORK AND LAMB

FD

HIGH PALATABILITY

INFUSED WITH FREEZE-DRIED BEEF AND LAMB LIVER

FRESH AND LOCAL

KENTUCKY VEGETABLES, FRUITS AND BOTANICALS

* MAXIMUM 25% CARBOHYDRATE (AS ESTIMATED BY NFE)

COMPLETE FOOD

FOR DOGS

ALL BREEDS | ALL LIFE STAGES

NET WEIGHT

13 LB | 5.9 KG

MADE IN OUR USA KENTUCKY KITCHENS

PREPARED WITH PRIDE FROM TRUSTED REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

ACANA®

REGIONALS

Appalachian Ranch

with RANCH-RAISED RED MEATS & FRESHWATER CATFISH

COMPLETE FOOD

FOR DOGS

ALL BREEDS | ALL LIFE STAGES

Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

This is the back of the bag



Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

This is a close-up of the top part of the back of the bag

ACANA

OUR MISSION IS CLEAR AND STRONG.

We've been making **BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™** ACANA dog foods from **FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS** in our **AWARD-WINNING KITCHENS** since 1985.

Regionally inspired, **ACANA REGIONALS** are Biologically Appropriate™ foods, brimming with ranch-raised meats, free-run poultry, nest-laid eggs and wild-caught fish, plus sun-ripened vegetables, fruits and botanicals — grown close to home by people we trust and delivered to our kitchens **FRESH or RAW**, so they're bursting with goodness and taste.

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™
Our foods mirror the richness, freshness and variety of meals for which **BISONS** ARE EVOLVED TO EAT.

REGIONALS
BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ | REGIONALLY INSPIRED

FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS
We focus on fresh ingredients from our regions that are raised, farmed or fished by people we know and trust.

NEVER RETURNED
We produce our **RAW** FROZEN in our **OWN KITCHENS** and we **DO NOT** freeze foods for anyone else.

**INGREDIENTS WE LOVE
PEOPLE WE TRUST**

FOOD CHOICES ARE SOME OF OUR MOST IMPORTANT DECISIONS AND KNOWING WHERE YOUR FOOD IS FROM HAS TAKEN ON NEW IMPORTANCE.

That's why we make **ACANA** in our own kitchens, from **Fresh Regional Ingredients** raised by people we trust, like **Rob of Bluegrass Bison** in **Shelbyville, Kentucky** — trusted supplier of **fresh ranch-raised bison**.

ROB OF BLUEGRASS BISON IN SHELBYVILLE, KENTUCKY. TRUSTED SUPPLIERS OF FRESH RANCH-RAISED BISON.

Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

This is a close-up of the middle part of the back of the bag

Appalachian Ranch

REGIONALS FORMULA

HONORING THE APPALACHIAN RANCHING HERITAGE, THIS REGION-INSPIRED DOG FOOD IS LOADED WITH ANGUS BEEF, AMERICAN YORKSHIRE PORK, KENTUCKY LAMB AND AMERICAN BISON, PLUS LOCAL VEGETABLES, FRUITS AND BOTANICALS. Delivered FRESH or RAW in WholePrey™ ratios, and brimming with goodness and taste, ACANA's high inclusions and rich diversity of meats, organs and cartilage mirror your dog's evolutionary diet and nourish peak health naturally, without the need for long lists of synthetic ingredients and supplements.

Prepared in our Kentucky DogStar® Kitchens with Fresh Regional Ingredients, this unique and Biologically Appropriate™ food is guaranteed to keep your dog healthy, happy and strong. Read our ingredients and we think you'll agree!



COMPLETE FOOD
FOR DOGS
ALL BREEDS • ALL LIFE STAGES

INGREDIENTS

Deboned beef, deboned pork, deboned lamb, lamb meal, beef meal, pork meal, whole red lentils, whole garbanzo beans, beef liver, beef fat, whole green lentils, whole green peas, whole chickpeas, catfish meal, deboned trout, whole blue catfish, pollock oil, lentil fiber, natural pork flavor, whole yellow peas, beef tripe, mutton tripe, lamb liver, pork liver, beef kidney, pork kidney, beef cartilage, whole pumpkin, whole butternut squash, mixed tocopherols (preservative), sea salt, zinc proteinate, dried kelp, kale, spinach, mustard greens, collard greens, turnip greens, whole carrots, whole apples, whole pears, vitamin A acetate, vitamin D3 supplement, freeze-dried beef liver, freeze-dried lamb liver, pumpkin seeds, sunflower seeds, copper proteinate, chicory root, turmeric, tartaric acid, alfalfa root, rosehips, juniper berries, dried Lactobacillus acidophilus fermentation product, dried Bifidobacterium animalis fermentation product, dried Lactobacillus casei fermentation product.

CALORIE CONTENT (calculated): Metabolizable Energy is 3425 kcal/kg (388 kcal per lb) as fed.

Calories distributed to support peak conditioning with 342 from protein, 241 from carbohydrates, and 421 from fat.

GUARANTEED ANALYSIS

Crude protein (min.)	28.0%
Crude fat (min.)	15.0%
Crude fiber (max.)	4.0%
Moisture (max.)	10.0%
DNA (deoxyribonucleic acid) (min.)	0.1%
SFA (saturated fatty acids) (min.)	0.1%
Calcium (min.)	1.2%
Phosphorus (min.)	1.2%
Omega-6 fatty acids (min.)	1.8%
Omega-3 fatty acids (min.)	0.6%
Glucosamine (min.)	250 mg/kg
Total Microorganisms (min.)	100M CFU/g
Lactobacillus acidophilus, Bifidobacterium animalis, Lactobacillus casei	

Not recognized as an essential nutrient by the AAFCO Dog Food Nutrient Profile.

ANÁLISIS DE GARANTÍA

Proteína cruda (mín.)	28.0%
Grasa cruda (mín.)	15.0%
Fibra cruda (máx.)	4.0%
Humedad (máx.)	10.0%
ADN (ácido desoxirribonucleico) (mín.)	0.1%
Grasas saturadas (mín.)	0.1%
Calcio (mín.)	1.2%
Fósforo (mín.)	1.2%
Ácidos grasos omega-6 (mín.)	1.8%
Ácidos grasos omega-3 (mín.)	0.6%
Glucosamina (mín.)	250 mg/kg
Microorganismos totales (mín.)	100M CFU/g
Lactobacillus acidophilus, Bifidobacterium animalis, Lactobacillus casei	

No reconocido como un nutriente esencial por el Perfil de Nutrientes para Alimentos para Perros de la AAFCO.

ES APPALACHIAN RANCH REGIONALS FORMULA

Res deshidratada, cerdo deshidratado, cordero deshidratado, cordero deshidratado, res deshidratada, cerdo deshidratado, lentejas rojas enteras, lentejas verdes enteras, lentejas verdes enteras, guisantes verdes enteros, garbanzos enteros, hígado de res, grasa de res, lentejas verdes enteras, aceite de abadejo de Alaska, fibra de lenteja, sabor natural de cerdo, guisantes amarillos enteros, tripa de res, tripa de cordero, hígado de cordero, hígado de cerdo, infusión de res, infusión de cerdo, cartilago de res, cartilago de cordero, calabacín amarillo entero, boniato, maíz (grain), sal de mar, probiótico de ácido, algas marinas secas, raíz de cúrcuma, hojas de mostaza, hojas de albahaca, hojas de hinojo, zanahorias enteras, manzanas enteras, peras enteras, extracto de vitamina A, Suplemento D3, hígado de res liofilizado, hígado de cordero liofilizado, semillas de calabaza, semillas de girasol, probiótico de cerdo, raíz de achicoria, cúrcuma, raíz de zanahoria, raíz de alfalfa, rosa mosqueta, bayas de amora, producto de la fermentación del Bifidobacterium animalis seco, producto de la fermentación del Lactobacillus casei seco.

CONTENIDO CALÓRICO (Calculado): La energía metabolizable es de 3425 kcal/kg (388 kcal/lb) as fed.

Hecho en USA por **COMPANION PETROODS USA, 12871 Bowling Green Road, Auburn, Kentucky 40301**, 1-877-555-3266. Siempre en ambiente fresco y seco. No apto para el consumo humano. Mantener fuera del alcance de los niños. USO VETERINARIO: PROHIBIDO SU USO EN LA ALIMENTACIÓN DE PERRONES.

CL	IMPORTADOR: Ciba Company, Agencia de Importación, 115, Luján, Buenos Aires, Argentina	PE	IMPORTADOR: Ciba Company, Agencia de Importación, 115, Luján, Buenos Aires, Argentina
GT	IMPORTADOR: Ciba Company, Agencia de Importación, 115, Luján, Buenos Aires, Argentina	UY	IMPORTADOR: Ciba Company, Agencia de Importación, 115, Luján, Buenos Aires, Argentina
DO	IMPORTADOR: Ciba Company, Agencia de Importación, 115, Luján, Buenos Aires, Argentina	MX	IMPORTADOR: Ciba Company, Agencia de Importación, 115, Luján, Buenos Aires, Argentina

Made with UNMATCHED REGIONAL INGREDIENTS DELIVERED FRESH

THIS 12 LB PACKAGE OF ACANA IS MADE WITH OVER **9** PREMIUM ANIMAL INGREDIENTS

Half are FRESH or RAW and loaded with goodness and taste, and half are DRIED or OILS that provide a strong and natural source of animal proteins and fats.

5 LBS + **2 LBS** + **1 LBS** + **5 LBS** + **5 LBS** + **5 LBS** + **5 LBS** + **5 LBS** + **5 LBS** + **5 LBS**

PLUS 4 1/2 LB OF WHOLE BEEF, PORK, LAMB AND POULTRY INGREDIENTS

WHOLEPREY™ DIET
MEAT | ORGANS | CARTILAGE

IN HER ETERNAL WISDOM, MOTHER NATURE MATCHED THE NUTRIENTS FOUND IN WHOLE FISH, FOWL, AND GAME TO PERFECTLY MEET THE NEEDS OF YOUR DOG.

Mimicking Mother Nature, ACANA WholePrey™ foods feature a nourishing balance of meat, liver, tripe, kidney and cartilage — all of which reflect the whole prey animal, DELIVERING NUTRIENTS NATURALLY.

That's why you won't find long lists of synthetic additives in ACANA foods.

OUR INGREDIENTS. OUR KITCHENS. OUR FOOD.
DELIVERED FRESH.

ACANA WHOLEPREY™ IS A 100% NATURAL, HIGH-QUALITY DOG FOOD. NO ARTIFICIAL PRESERVATIVES OR ADDED SALT.




Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

This is a close-up of the bottom part of the back of the bag



DOG WEIGHT		LESS ACTIVE		ACTIVE	
POUNDS (KG)		CUPS/DAY		CUPS/DAY	
4-8 lb	2-4 kg	1/2 c	3/4 c	1/2 c	3/4 c
11-15 lb	5-7 kg	1/2 c	3/4 c	1/2 c	3/4 c
22-30 lb	10-14 kg	1 c	1 1/4 c	1 c	1 1/4 c
44-50 lb	20-23 kg	1 1/2 c	1 3/4 c	1 1/2 c	1 3/4 c
66-80 lb	30-36 kg	2 1/4 c	2 3/4 c	2 1/4 c	2 3/4 c
88-110 lb	40-50 kg	3 c	3 1/2 c	3 c	3 1/2 c
132-150 lb	60-68 kg	4 c	4 1/2 c	4 c	4 1/2 c

Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

On the next few screens, you will see the words that are printed on the back of the bag you saw earlier.

Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

ACANA

OUR MISSION IS CLEAR AND STRONG.

We've been making BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ ACANA dog foods from FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS in our AWARD-WINNING KITCHENS since 1985.

Regionally inspired, ACANA REGIONALS are Biologically Appropriate™ foods, brimming with ranch-raised meats, free-run poultry, nest-laid eggs and wild-caught fish, plus sun-ripened vegetables, fruits and botanicals-grown close to home by people we trust and delivered to our kitchens FRESH or RAW, so they're bursting with goodness and taste.

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™

Our foods mirror the richness, freshness and variety of meats for which DOGS ARE EVOLVED TO EAT.

FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

We focus on fresh ingredients from our region that are ranched, farmed or fished by people we know and trust.

NEVER OUTSOURCED

We prepare our OWN FOODS in our OWN KITCHENS and we DON'T make foods for anyone else.

REGIONALS

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ | REGIONALLY INSPIRED


INGREDIENTS WE LOVE

PEOPLE WE TRUST

FOOD CHOICES ARE SOME OF OUR MOST IMPORTANT DECISIONS AND KNOWING WHERE YOUR FOOD IS FROM HAS TAKEN ON NEW IMPORTANCE.

That's why we make ACANA in our own kitchens, from Fresh Regional Ingredients raised by people we trust, like Rob of Bluegrass Bison in Shelbyville, Kentucky-trusted supplier of fresh ranch-raised bison.

Next >>



DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

ROB OF BLUEGRASS BISON IN SHELBYVILLE, KENTUCKY. TRUSTED SUPPLIERS OF FRESH RANCH-RAISED BISON.

Appalachian Ranch

REGIONALS FORMULA

COMPLETE FOOD

FOR DOGS

ALL BREEDS | ALL LIFE STAGES

HONORING THE APPALACHIAN RANCHING HERITAGE, THIS REGION-INSPIRED DOG FOOD IS LOADED WITH ANGUS BEEF, AMERICAN YORKSHIRE PORK, KENTUCKY LAMB AND AMERICAN BISON, PLUS LOCAL VEGETABLES, FRUITS AND BOTANICALS.

Delivered FRESH or RAW, in WholePrey™ ratios, and brimming with goodness and taste, ACANA's high inclusions and rich diversity of meats, organs and cartilage mirror your dog's evolutionary diet and nourish peak health naturally, without the need for long lists of synthetic ingredients and supplements.

Prepared in our Kentucky DogStar® Kitchens with Fresh Regional Ingredients, this unique and Biologically Appropriate™ food is guaranteed to keep your dog healthy, happy and strong. Read our ingredients and we think you'll agree!

Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

INGREDIENTS

Deboned beef, deboned pork, deboned lamb, lamb meal, beef meal, pork meal, whole red lentils, whole pinto beans, beef liver, beef fat, whole green lentils, whole green peas, whole chickpeas, catfish meal, deboned bison, whole blue catfish, pollock oil, lentil fiber, natural pork flavor, whole yellow peas, beef tripe, mutton tripe, lamb liver, pork liver, beef kidney, pork kidney, beef cartilage, whole pumpkin, whole butternut squash, mixed tocopherols (preservative), sea salt, zinc proteinate, dried kelp, kale, spinach, mustard greens, collard greens, turnip greens, whole carrots, whole apples, whole pears, vitamin A acetate, vitamin D3 supplement, freeze-dried beef liver, freeze-dried lamb liver, pumpkin seeds, sunflower seeds, copper proteinate, chicory root, turmeric, sarsaparilla root, althea root, rosehips, juniper berries, dried lactobacillus acidophilus fermentation product, dried bifidobacterium animalis fermentation product, dried lactobacillus casei fermentation product.

CALORIE CONTENT (calculated): Metabolizable Energy is 3405 kcal/kg (388 kcal per 8 oz cup).

Calories distributed to support peak conditioning with 34% from protein, 24% from carbohydrates, and 42% from fat.

GUARANTEED ANALYSIS

Crude protein (min.)	33%
Crude fat (min.)	17%
Crude fiber (max.)	6%
Moisture (max.)	12%
DHA (docosahexaenoic acid) (min.)	0.1%
EPA (eicosapentaenoic acid) (min.)	0.1%
Calcium (min.)	1.7%
Phosphorus (min.)	1.2%
Omega-6 fatty acids* (min.)	1.8%
Omega-3 fatty acids* (min.)	0.6%
Glucosamine* (min.)	250 mg/kg
Total Microorganisms* (min.)	100M CFU/lb

(Lactobacillus acidophilus, Bifidobacterium animalis, Lactobacillus casei)

* Not recognized as an essential nutrient by the AAFCO Dog Food Nutrient Profiles

Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

2DAILY RATION AND FEEDING GUIDE

8 OZ CUP IS 114 G OF FOOD

DOG WEIGHT		LESS ACTIVE 1 hour or LESS daily exercise		ACTIVE 1 hour or MORE daily exercise	
LB	KG	CUPS/DAY	GR/DAY	CUPS/DAY	GR/DAY
4 lb	2 kg	1/3 c	38 g	1/2 c	57 g
11 lb	5 kg	2/3 c	76 g	1 c	114 g
22 lb	10 kg	1 c	114 g	1 1/2 c	171 g
44 lb	20 kg	1 2/3 c	190 g	2 1/2 c	285 g
66 lb	30 kg	2 1/3 c	266 g	3 1/2 c	399 g
88 lb	40 kg	3 c	342 g	4 1/4 c	485 g
110 lb	50 kg	3 1/3 c	380 g	5 c	570 g
132 lb	60 kg	4 c	456 g	5 3/4 c	656 g

EVERY DOG IS DIFFERENT. FEEDING AMOUNT WILL VARY WITH AGE AND ACTIVITY.

Use this chart as an initial guide and adjust amounts accordingly.

Feed twice daily and always provide fresh clean water.

PUPPIES: at 1 1/2-3 months old feed twice the adult amount, at 3-6 months feed 1 1/2 times the adult amount. At 6-11 months feed 1 1/4 times the adult amount.

GESTATION: increase from 25% to 50% of the adult amount.

LACTATION: feed "free choice."

ACANA Appalachian Ranch Dog is formulated to meet the nutritional levels established by the AAFCO Dog Food Nutrient Profiles for All Life Stages, except for growth of large size dogs (70 lb or more as an adult).

Made with UNMATCHED REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

DELIVERED FRESH

THIS 13 LB PACKAGE OF ACANA IS MADE WITH OVER 9 LB PREMIUM ANIMAL INGREDIENTS

Half are FRESH or RAW and loaded with goodness and taste, and half are DRIED or OILS that provide a strong and natural source of animal proteins and fats.

Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

2 LB* BEEF, LIVER, TRIPE +

1 LB* PORK, LIVER, KIDNEY +

3/4 LB* LAMB, LIVER, TRIPE +

6 1/2 OZ* FRESHWATER CATFISH +

6 1/2 OZ* AMERICAN BISON

PLUS 4 1/2 LB* OF DRIED BEEF, PORK, LAMB AND FISH INGREDIENTS

* APPROXIMATE AMOUNTS

WHOLEPREY™ DIET

MEAT | ORGANS | CARTILAGE

IN HER ETERNAL WISDOM, MOTHER NATURE MATCHED THE NUTRIENTS FOUND IN WHOLE FISH, FOWL AND GAME TO PERFECTLY MEET THE NEEDS OF YOUR DOG.

Mirroring Mother Nature, ACANA WholePrey™ foods feature a nourishing balance of meat, liver, tripe, kidney and cartilage—all of which reflect the whole prey animal, DELIVERING NUTRIENTS NATURALLY.

That's why you won't find long lists of synthetic additives in ACANA foods.

OUR INGREDIENTS.

OUR KITCHENS.

OUR FOOD.

TRUSTED EVERYWHERE.

JOHN OF ROUNDSTONE NATIVE SEED IN UPTON, KENTUCKY.

TRUSTED SUPPLIER OF FRESH AND LOCAL BOTANICALS.

Kentucky Proud

MADE IN KENTUCKY BY CHAMPION PETFOODS USA INC.

12871 BOWLING GREEN ROAD, AUBURN, KENTUCKY 42206

US REG. 15415996410 | EU REG.

CHAMPIONPETFOODS.COM

DOGSTAR

KITCHENS

CUSTOMER CARE (USA)

TOLL FREE [1-877-879-0006](tel:1-877-879-0006)

FOLLOW US ONLINE

ACANA.COM

@ACANAPETFOOD @CHAMPIONPETFOOD

AD_003


APPALACHIAN RANCH DOG REGIONALS FORMULA

13 LB | 5.9 KG

Next >>


DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy



DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy



DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

UNMATCHED REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

FRESH OR RAW

ETHICALLY RAISED on AMERICAN FARMS & RANCHES

REGIONALS

Appalachian Ranch

with RANCH-RAISED RED MEATS & FRESHWATER CATFISH

COMPLETE FOOD

FOR DOGS


ALL BREEDS | ALL LIFE STAGES


Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

This is the other side of the bag


MADE IN OUR  KENTUCKY KITCHENS



REGIONALS

Appalachian Ranch

RANCH-RAISED RED MEATS & FRESHWATER CATFISH

 COMPLETE FOOD FOR DOGS

Next >>

588


DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

UnderstandingAmericaStudy

On the next screen, you will see the words that are printed on the other side of the bag you saw earlier.

Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

Next >>



DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$

UnderstandingAmericaStudy

MADE IN OUR USA KENTUCKY KITCHENS

Made with unmatched REGIONAL INGREDIENTS KENTUCKY KITCHENS

REGIONALS

Appalachian Ranch


with RANCH-RAISED RED MEATS & FRESHWATER CATFISH

COMPLETE FOOD

FOR DOGS

ALL BREEDS | ALL LIFE STAGES

Next >>



DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy


This is the front of the bag



Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$ DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy



DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

This is a close-up of the middle part of the front of the bag




Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

This is a close-up of the bottom part of the front of the bag



60% PREMIUM MEAT INGREDIENTS
IN NOURISHING WHOLEPREY™ RATIOS

40% VEGETABLES, FRUITS, BOTANICALS
PLUS ESSENTIAL VITAMINS AND MINERALS¹

0% GRAIN, POTATO, GLUTENS
POULTRY BY-PRODUCTS, PLANT PROTEIN CONCENTRATES

* MAXIMUM 30% CARBOHYDRATE (AS ESTIMATED BY NFE)
¹Plus natural preservatives. Contains a source of live (inactivated) naturally occurring microorganisms.

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™
RICH IN ANIMAL PROTEIN, CARBOHYDRATE-LIMITED*

WHOLEPREY™ SUPERFOOD
MEAT + ORGANS + CARTILAGE

FRESH AND REGIONAL
LOCAL INGREDIENTS DELIVERED DAILY

NATURAL PALATABILITY
INFUSED WITH FREEZE-DRIED LAMB LIVER

ALL BREEDS
ALL LIFE STAGES

USA AWARD-WINNING
DOOSTAR® KITCHENS

SAFE QUALITY FOOD
CERTIFIED KITCHEN

NET WEIGHT 13 LB | 5.9 KG

Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

On the next few screens, you will see the words that are printed on the front of the bag you just saw.
Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

EASY OPEN

LIFT AND PULL TAB TO YOUR RIGHT

DO NOT CUT

AMERICAN CHOICE AWARDS VOTED Best Brand National Winner

UNMATCHED REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

DELIVERED FRESH OR RAW

ANGUS BEEF Liberty, Kentucky

+

YORKSHIRE PORK Fannettsburg, Pennsylvania

+

GRASS-FED LAMB Russellville, Kentucky

+

VEGETABLES & FRUITS Kentucky farms

NON-GMO INGREDIENTS FROM AMERICAN RANCHES AND FARMS

ACANAB®

HERITAGE

OUR ORIGINAL BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ FOODS

AMERICA'S FERTILE FARMS AND RANCHES

OUR SOURCE OF INSPIRATION AND FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

RED MEAT FORMULA with FRESH ANGUS BEEF, YORKSHIRE PORK & GRASS-FED LAMB

60% PREMIUM MEAT INGREDIENTS

IN NOURISHING WHOLEPREY™ RATIOS

40% VEGETABLES, FRUITS, BOTANICALS

PLUS ESSENTIAL VITAMINS AND MINERALS†

0% GRAIN, POTATO, GLUTENS

POULTRY BY-PRODUCTS, PLANT PROTEIN CONCENTRATES

* MAXIMUM 30% CARBOHYDRATE (AS ESTIMATED BY NFE)

USA AWARD-WINNING DOGSTAR® KITCHENS

SAFE QUALITY FOOD CERTIFIED KITCHEN

† Plus natural preservatives. Contains a source of live (viable) naturally occurring microorganisms.

Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

WHOLEPREY™ DIET

MEAT | ORGANS | CARTILAGE

ACANA®

AMERICA'S FERTILE FARMS AND RANCHES

OUR SOURCE OF INSPIRATION AND FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

Appalachian Ranch

with RANCH-RAISED RED MEATS & FRESHWATER CATFISH

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ | REGIONALLY INSPIRED

BA

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™

PROTEIN-RICH, CARBOHYDRATE-LIMITED*

WHOLEPREY DIET™

MEAT, LIVER, TRIPE AND CARTILAGE

Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™

RICH IN ANIMAL PROTEIN, CARBOHYDRATE-LIMITED*

WHOLEPREY™ SUPERFOOD

MEAT + ORGANS + CARTILAGE

FRESH AND REGIONAL

LOCAL INGREDIENTS DELIVERED DAILY

FD

NATURAL PALATABILITY

INFUSED WITH FREEZE-DRIED LAMB LIVER

ALL BREEDS

ALL LIFE STAGES

NET WEIGHT 13 LB | 5.9 KG

Next >>

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

This is the back of the bag

[illegible]

[Next >>](#)

DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

This is a close-up of the top part of the back of the bag



Next >> :

DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

This is a close-up of the middle part of the back of the bag

RED MEAT FORMULA

WITH 100% WHOLE MEAT, INCLUDING FRESH MEAT & BONE

YOUR DOG IS A CARNIVORE, DESIGNED BY NATURE TO THRIVE ON WHOLE GAME, FOWL, OR FISH. POSSESSING A BIOLOGICAL NEED FOR FOODS THAT ARE RICH AND VARIED IN HIGH-QUALITY MEAT PROTEIN.

That's why ACANA RED MEAT FORMULA is brimming with protein from Angus beef, Yorkshire pork and grass-fed lamb — delivered fresh from regional farms in richly nourishing WholePrey™ ratios that promote peak health naturally, without long lists of synthetic additives, grains or GMO ingredients.

Prepared in our award-winning DogStar® Kitchens to our Biologically Appropriate™ standards, ACANA keeps your cherished dog healthy, happy and strong. Read our ingredients and we think you'll agree.

INGREDIENTS

Deboned beef, deboned pork, beef meat, whole red lentils, whole chickpeas, whole green peas, whole green peas, pork meat, beef fat, whole green lentils, whole chickpeas, whole yellow peas, deboned lamb, chicken gelatin, whole fiber, natural pork flavor, beef tallow, beef liver, beef kidney, pork liver, pork kidney, beef cartilage, whole parsnip, whole butternut squash, mixed mushrooms, green lentils, dried wild rice, prebiotic, organic greens, turmeric, whole carrots, whole apples, whole pears, freeze-dried beef liver, freeze-dried pork liver, freeze-dried lamb liver, calcium phosphate, hydrolyzed chicken & egg whites, D3 supplement, chicken rice, turmeric, sarsaparilla root, alfalfa root, rose hips, juniper berries, dried schizandra scholimbifolia fermentation product, dried schizanthus americanus fermentation product, dried schizanthus americanus fermentation product.

GUARANTEED ANALYSIS

Crude Protein (min)	28%
Crude Fat (min)	12%
Crude Fiber (max)	2.5%
Moisture (max)	10%
Calcium (min)	0.1%
Phosphorus (min)	0.1%
Omega-3 fatty acids (min)	0.1%
Omega-6 fatty acids (min)	0.1%
Antioxidant (min)	0.1%
Antibiotic (min)	0.1%
Antifungal (min)	0.1%
Antiparasitic (min)	0.1%
Anticancer (min)	0.1%
Antiviral (min)	0.1%
Antibacterial (min)	0.1%
Antiparasitic (min)	0.1%
Anticancer (min)	0.1%
Antiviral (min)	0.1%
Antibacterial (min)	0.1%

NET WT 5 LB (2.27 kg)

ACANA RED MEAT FORMULA

MADE IN KENTUCKY BY CHAMPION PETFOODS USA, INC.
11011 BOWLING GREEN ROAD, BOWLING GREEN, KENTUCKY 40304
800.888.1101 | CHAMPIONPETFOODS.COM

DOGSTAR
KITCHENS

CUSTOMER CARE LINE
TOLL-FREE 1.877.726.8866

ACANA.COM

RED MEAT FORMULA
COOL, 75 BAG

8 44924 50313 0

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™

EVOLUTIONARY PET | PROTEIN-RICH, CARBOHYDRATE-LIMITED

7 3/4 LB

PREMIUM ANIMAL INGREDIENTS

1 1/2 LB*
FRESH ANGUS BEEF

1 1/2 LB*
FRESH YORKSHIRE PORK

1/2 LB*
FRESH GRASS-FED LAMB

PLUS 3 1/4 LB* OF DRIED BEEF AND PORK INGREDIENTS

SUPERFOOD FOR DOGS

WholePrey™ ratios of meat, organs and cartilage deliver nutrients naturally, without long lists of synthetic additives.

FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

INGREDIENTS WE LOVE, PEOPLE WE TRUST.

50%

FRESH

50%

DRIED

HALF of our meats are FRESH and loaded with goodness and HALF are DRIED to provide a concentrated source of Biologically Appropriate™ protein that cannot be supplied by fresh meats alone.

FRESH VEGETABLES & FRUITS

Our pumpkin, greens, carrots and apples are delivered FRESH and WHOLE from local farms and orchards.

Next >>

599

DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

This is a close-up of the bottom part of the back of the bag



Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

On the next few screens, you will see the words that are printed on the back of the bag you saw earlier.

Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

KELLY OF M&E FAMILY FARMS IN RUSSELLVILLE, KENTUCKY. TRUSTED SUPPLIER OF FRESH LOCAL LAMB.

Kentucky Proud

ACANA®

HERITAGE

OUR ORIGINAL BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ FOODS

OUR FOOD, OUR HERITAGE.

Prepared to our Biologically Appropriate™ standards and brimming with Fresh Regional Ingredients, ACANA HERITAGE celebrates our quarter-century tradition of preparing award-winning foods with exceptional value.

Reinhard Mühlenfeld

Founder

RED MEAT FORMULA

WITH FRESH ANGUS BEEF, YORKSHIRE PORK & GRASS-FED LAMB

ALL BREEDS

ALL LIFE STAGES

YOUR DOG IS A CARNIVORE, DESIGNED BY NATURE TO THRIVE ON WHOLE GAME, FOWL OR FISH, POSSESSING A BIOLOGICAL NEED FOR FOODS THAT ARE RICH AND VARIED IN HIGH-QUALITY MEAT PROTEIN.

That's why ACANA RED MEAT FORMULA is brimming with protein from Angus beef, Yorkshire pork and grass-fed lamb-delivered fresh from regional farms in richly nourishing WholePrey™ ratios that promote peak health naturally, without long lists of synthetic additives, grains or GMO ingredients.

Prepared in our award-winning DogStar® Kitchens to our Biologically Appropriate™ standards, ACANA keeps your cherished dog healthy, happy and strong. Read our ingredients and we think you'll agree.

Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

INGREDIENTS

Deboned beef, deboned pork, beef meal, whole red lentils, whole pinto beans, whole green peas, pork meal, beef fat, whole green lentils, whole chickpeas, whole yellow peas, deboned lamb, alaskan pollock oil, lentil fiber, natural pork flavor, beef tripe, beef liver, beef kidney, pork liver, pork kidney, beef cartilage, whole pumpkin, whole butternut squash, mixed tocopherols (preservative), dried kelp, zinc proteinate, collard greens, turnip greens, whole carrots, whole apples, whole pears, freeze-dried beef liver, freeze-dried pork liver, freeze-dried lamb liver, calcium pantothenate, riboflavin, vitamin A acetate, D3 supplement, chicory root, turmeric, sarsaparilla root, althea root, rose hips, juniper berries, dried lactobacillus acidophilus fermentation product, dried bifidobacterium animalis fermentation product, dried lactobacillus casei fermentation product.

CALORIE CONTENT (calculated): Metabolizable Energy is 3405 kcal/kg (388 kcal per standard 8 oz cup).

Calories distributed to support peak conditioning with 30% from protein, 28% from fruits and vegetables, and 42% from fat.

GUARANTEED ANALYSIS

Crude protein (min.)	25%
Crude fat (min.)	17%
Crude fiber (max.)	6%
Moisture (max.)	12%
DHA (docosahexaenoic acid) (min.)	0.15%
EPA (eicosapentaenoic acid) (min.)	0.15%
Calcium (min.)	1.4%
Phosphorus (min.)	1%
Omega-6 fatty acids* (min.)	2.1%
Omega-3 fatty acids* (min.)	0.8%
Glucosamine* (min.)	300 mg/kg
Total Microorganisms* (min.)	100M CFU/lb

(Lactobacillus acidophilus, Bifidobacterium animalis, Lactobacillus casei)

* not recognized as an essential nutrient by the AAFCO Dog Food Nutrient Profiles

Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

MADE IN KENTUCKY BY CHAMPION PETFOODS USA INC.

12871 BOWLING GREEN ROAD, AUBURN, KENTUCKY 42206

EU REG. | CHAMPIONPETFOODS.COM

DOGSTAR® KITCHENS

CUSTOMER CARE (USA)

TOLL-FREE [1.877.539.0006](tel:18775390006)

FOLLOW US ONLINE

ACANA.COM

@ACANAPETFOOD @CHAMPIONPETFOOD

Interseroh DSI

AD_001

RED MEAT FORMULA

13 LB | 5.9 KG

OUR INGREDIENTS.

OUR KITCHENS.

OUR FOOD.

TRUSTED EVERYWHERE.

TRAVIS AND NATALIA, COMMITTED TO SAFE QUALITY FOODS.

DOGSTAR® KITCHENS. AUBURN, KENTUCKY.

BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™

EVOLUTIONARY DIET | PROTEIN-RICH, CARBOHYDRATE-LIMITED.

7 3/4 LB PREMIUM ANIMAL INGREDIENTS

1 2/3 LB* FRESH ANGUS BEEF

+

1 1/2 LB* FRESH YORKSHIRE PORK

2/3 LB* FRESH GRASS-FED LAMB

PLUS 3 3/4 LB* OF DRIED BEEF AND PORK INGREDIENTS

* APPROXIMATE AMOUNTS

WHOLEPREY™ DIET

MEAT | ORGANS | CARTILAGE

SUPERFOOD FOR DOGS

Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

WholePrey™ ratios of meat, organs and cartilage deliver nutrients naturally, without long lists of synthetic additives.

FRESH REGIONAL INGREDIENTS

INGREDIENTS WE LOVE. PEOPLE WE TRUST.

50% FRESH + 50% DRIED

HALF of our meats are FRESH and loaded with goodness and HALF are DRIED to provide a concentrated source of Biologically Appropriate™ protein that cannot be supplied by fresh meats alone.

FRESH VEGETABLES & FRUITS

Our pumpkin, greens, carrots and apples are delivered FRESH and WHOLE from local farms and orchards.

NEVER OUTSOURCED

OUR INGREDIENTS. OUR KITCHENS. OUR FOODS.

DOGSTAR® KITCHENS

SAFE QUALITY FOOD CERTIFIED KITCHEN

THE FOOD YOU CHOOSE FOR YOUR DOG IS AN IMPORTANT DECISION.


That's why we make ACANA in our award-winning kitchens where we control all aspects of food preparation from ingredient selection to packaging.

We wouldn't have it any other way. We believe you wouldn't either.

Next >>


DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy




DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy



DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy



DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

On the next screen, you will see the words that are printed on the other side of the bag you saw earlier.

Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

DAILY RATION AND FEEDING GUIDE

8 OZ CUP IS 114 G OF FOOD

DOG WEIGHT		LESS ACTIVE		ACTIVE	
		1 hour or LESS daily exercise		1 hour or MORE daily exercise	
LB	KG	CUPS/DAY	GR/DAY	CUPS/DAY	GR/DAY
4 1/2 lb	2 kg	1/4 c	28 g	1/2 c	57 g
11 lb	5 kg	2/3 c	76 g	1 c	114 g
22 lb	10 kg	1 c	114 g	1 1/2 c	171 g
44 lb	20 kg	1 2/3 c	190 g	2 1/2 c	285 g
66 lb	30 kg	2 1/4 c	256 g	3 1/2 c	399 g
88 lb	40 kg	2 3/4 c	314 g	4 1/4 c	485 g
110 lb	50 kg	3 1/3 c	380 g	5 c	570 g
132 lb	60 kg	3 3/4 c	427 g	5 3/4 c	656 g

EVERY DOG IS DIFFERENT. FEEDING AMOUNTS WILL VARY WITH AGE AND ACTIVITY.

Use this chart as an initial guide and adjust amounts accordingly.

Feed twice daily and always provide fresh clean water.

PUPPIES: at 1 1/2-3 months old feed twice the adult amount, at 3-6 months old feed 1 1/2 times the adult amount. At 6-11 months feed 1 1/4 times the adult amount.

GESTATION: increase from 25% to 50%.

LACTATION: feed "free choice."

ACANA RED MEAT FORMULA is formulated to meet the nutritional levels established by the AAFCO Dog Food Nutrient Profiles for All Life Stages, including growth of large size dogs (70 lb or more as an adult).

HERITAGE


OUR ORIGINAL BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ FOODS

Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

This is the bottom of the bag



Next >>

A progress bar at the bottom shows the current screen is highlighted in blue.

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

On the next screen, you will see the words that are printed on the bottom of the bag you saw earlier.

Please read the words on each screen and then go on to the next screen.

Next >>

A progress bar at the bottom shows the current screen is highlighted in blue.

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

HERITAGE

OUR ORIGINAL BIOLOGICALLY APPROPRIATE™ FOODS

ACANA®

RED MEAT FORMULA

ALL BREEDS

ALL LIFE STAGES

DOG FOOD

NET WEIGHT

13 LB | 5.9KG

Next >>

IF Pento=1

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

Next, you will read some information about the dog food that is not on the package.

The dog food you saw may contain a drug called pentobarbital. According to the U.S. government, pentobarbital is used to calm animals, to put them to sleep, to reduce their feelings of pain, and to end their lives.

Next >>

DISPLAY PAGE IF pento = 2

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

Next, you will read some information about the dog food that is not on the package.

According to the U.S. government, the dog food you saw was made with meat products provided by a company that did not make sure to keep out meat from animals whose lives had been ended by giving them a drug called pentobarbital.

Next >>



QUALITY

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

How would you rate the **quality** of this dog food? Excellent, good, fair, poor, or very poor?

☐ Excellent

☐ Good

☐ Fair

☐ Poor

☐ Very poor

Next >>



HEALTHY

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

How **healthy** would you say this dog food is? Extremely healthy, very healthy, moderately healthy, slightly healthy, or not healthy at all?

☐ Extremely healthy


☐ Very healthy

☐ Moderately healthy

☐ Slightly healthy

☐ Not healthy at all

Next >>



FOOD_EVER

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

Did you ever buy dog food, or did you never do that?

☐ Bought dog food

☐ Never bought dog food

Next >>



DISPLAY IF $fc = 1$ AND $FOOD_EVER = 1$

The dog food you looked at is called Orijen Regional Red

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

The dog food you looked at is called Orijen Regional Red .

Did you ever buy that type of dog food, or did you never buy it?

☐ Did buy it

☐ Did not buy it

Next >>

SPEC_BUY.

DISPLAY IF $fc = 2$ AND $FOOD_EVER = 1$

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

The dog food you looked at is called Acana Regionals Appalachian Ranch.

Did you ever buy that type of dog food; or did you never buy it?

- ☐ Did buy it
- ☐ Did not buy it

Next >>

DISPLAY IF $fc = 3$ AND $FOOD_EVER = 1$

UnderstandingAmericaStudy

The dog food you looked at is called Acana Heritage Red Meat .

Did you ever buy that type of dog food, or did you never buy it?

- ☐ Did buy it
☐ Did not buy it

Next >>

DISPLAY IF SPEC_BUY = 1 & fc = 1
SPEC_BUY.

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

Did you buy this dog food after July 1, 2013, or did you NOT buy this dog food after that date?

☐ Did buy it after July 1, 2013

☐ Did not do that

Next >>

SPEC_CLASS

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

Did you buy this dog food after July 1, 2013, or did you NOT buy this dog food after that date?

☐ Did buy it after July 1, 2013

☐ Did not do that

Next >>

DISPLAY IF([fc = 2 OR fc = 3] & FOOD_EVER = 1)OR (fc = 1 & SPEC_BUY = 2)

ORIJEN_BUY.

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

Did you ever buy dog food that had the word "Orjen" written on the package, or did you never do that?

☐ Did buy it

☐ Did not buy it

Next >>

DISPLAY IF ORIJEN_BUY = 1

ORIJEN_CLASS.

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

Did you buy dog food that had the word "Orjen" written on the package after July 1, 2013, or did you not do that?

☐ Did buy it after July 1, 2013

☐ Did not do that

Next >>

DISPLAY IF (*fc* = 1 & *FOOD_EVER* = 1) OR ([*fc* = 2 OR *fc* = 3] & *SPEC_PURCH* = 2)

ACANA_BUY.

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

Did you ever buy dog food that had the word "Acana" written on the package, or did you never do that?

- ☐ Did buy it
- ☐ Did not do that

Next >>

DISPLAY IF *ACANA_BUY* = 1

ACANA_CLASS.

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

Did you buy dog food that had the word "Acana" written on the package after July 1, 2013, or did you not do that?

- ☐ Did buy it after July 1, 2013
- ☐ Did not buy it

Next >>

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1

DOG_NUM.

UnderstandingAmericaStudy

What is the total number of dogs you have owned since you were 18 years old?

Next >>

A progress bar at the bottom shows the first step is completed, indicated by a blue segment.

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1

DOG_CURR.

UnderstandingAmericaStudy

Do you own that dog now, or do you not own it now?

☐ Own it now

☐ Do not own it now

Next >>

A progress bar at the bottom shows the first step is completed, indicated by a blue segment.

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM >1

DOGS_CURR.

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

Do you own one of those dogs now, or do you not own any of those dogs now?

- ☐ Own one or more dogs now
- ☐ Do not own any dogs now

Next >>



DISPLAY IF DOG_CURR = 2

DOG_CLASS.

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

Did you own that dog before July 1, 2013, or did you not own it then?

- ☐ Owned dog before July 1, 2013
- ☐ Did not own dog before July 1, 2013

Next >>



DISPLAY IF DOGS_CURR = 2

DOGS_CLASS.

UnderstandingAmericaStudy

Did you own any of those dogs before July 1, 2013, or did you not own any of them then?

☐ Owned one or more dogs before July 1, 2013

☐ Did not own any dogs before July 1, 2013

Next >>

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1 & DOG_CURR = 1

WEIGHT1A.

UnderstandingAmericaStudy

In the box below, please type how many pounds your dog has weighed, on average, during the time you have owned it.

pounds

Next >>

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1 & DOG_CURR = 1

WEIGHT1B

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

In the box below, please type how many pounds your dog weighed, on average, during the time you have owned it.

pounds

Next >>

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1 AND DOG_NUM < 21

PROGRAMMING NOTE: IN THE QUESTION BELOW, X WILL BE REPLACED WITH THE NUMBER OF DOGS OWNED

WEIGHTX

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

In the boxes below, please type how many pounds each of your dogs weighed, on average, during the time you have owned it.

<input type="text"/>	pounds
<input type="text"/>	pounds
<input type="text"/>	pounds
<input type="text"/>	pounds
<input type="text"/>	pounds
<input type="text"/>	pounds
<input type="text"/>	pounds
<input type="text"/>	pounds
<input type="text"/>	pounds
<input type="text"/>	pounds
<input type="text"/>	pounds
<input type="text"/>	pounds
<input type="text"/>	pounds
<input type="text"/>	pounds
<input type="text"/>	pounds
<input type="text"/>	pounds
<input type="text"/>	pounds
<input type="text"/>	pounds
<input type="text"/>	pounds
<input type="text"/>	pounds
<input type="text"/>	pounds

Next >>

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1 & DOG_CURR = 1
DOG_HEALTHY_PRES

UnderstandingAmericaStudy

How important to you is it that your dog is as **healthy** as possible? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

- ☐ Extremely important
- ☐ Very important
- ☐ Moderately important
- ☐ Slightly important
- ☐ Not important at all

Next >>

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1 & DOG_CURR = 2

DOG_HEALTHY_PAST.

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

How important to you was it that your dog was as **healthy** as possible? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

- ☐ Extremely important
- ☐ Very important
- ☐ Moderately important
- ☐ Slightly important
- ☐ Not important at all

Next >>

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM >1 & DOGS_CURR = 1

DOGS_HEALTHY_PRES.

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

How important to you is that your dogs are as **healthy** as possible? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

- ☐ Extremely important
- ☐ Very important
- ☐ Moderately important
- ☐ Slightly important
- ☐ Not important at all

Next >>

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM >1 & DOGS_CURR = 2

DOGS_HEALTHY_PAST.

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

How important to you was that your dogs were as **healthy** as possible? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

☐ Extremely important

☐ Very important

☐ Moderately important

☐ Slightly important

☐ Not important at all

Next >>

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1 & DOG_CURR = 1

DOG_SAFE_PRES.

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

How important to you is it that your dog is as **safe** as possible? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

☐ Extremely important

☐ Very important

☐ Moderately important

☐ Slightly important

☐ Not important at all

Next >>



DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1 & DOG_CURR = 2

DOG_SAFE_PAST.

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

How important to you was it that your dog was as **safe** as possible? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

☐ Extremely important


☐ Very important

☐ Moderately important

☐ Slightly important

☐ Not important at all

Next >>



DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM >1 & DOGS_CURR = 1

DOGS_SAFE_PRES.

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

How important to you is that your dogs are as **safe** as possible? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

- ☐ Extremely important
- ☐ Very important
- ☐ Moderately important
- ☐ Slightly important
- ☐ Not important at all

Next >>

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM >1 & DOGS_CURR = 2

DOGS_SAFE_PAST.

UnderstandingAmericaStudy

How important to you was that your dogs were as **safe** as possible? Extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

☐ Extremely important

☐ Very important

☐ Moderately important

☐ Slightly important

☐ Not important at all

Next >>

End of safe

DISPLAY IF FOOD_EVER = 1 & DOG_EVER = 1

FOOD_PETSTORE.

UnderstandingAmericaStudy

Did you ever buy dog food from a store that sells only pet supplies, or did you never do that?

☐ Did that

☐ Never did that

Next >>

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 0

BOOKS_INGRED.

UnderstandingAmericaStudy

Did you ever read books, magazines, or information online to learn about what ingredients are in dog foods to decide which ones to buy, or did you never do that?

☐ Did that

☐ Never did that

Next >>

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1

FOOD_ALLNATURAL.

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

If you were to buy dog food, when deciding which food to buy, how much attention would you pay to whether or not the food is **all-natural**? A great deal of attention, a lot of attention, a moderate amount of attention, a little attention, or none at all?

☐ A great deal


☐ A lot

☐ A moderate amount

☐ A little

☐ None at all

Next >>



DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1

FOOD_GRAINFREE

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

If you were to buy dog food, when deciding which food to buy, how much attention would you pay to whether or not the food is **grain free**? A great deal of attention, a lot of attention, a moderate amount of attention, a little attention, or none at all?

☐ A great deal


☐ A lot

☐ A moderate amount

☐ A little

☐ None at all

Next >>



DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1

FOOD_ORGANIC

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

If you were to buy dog food, when deciding which food to buy, how much attention would you pay to whether or not the food is **organic**? A great deal of attention, a lot of attention, a moderate amount of attention, a little attention, or none at all?

- ☐ A great deal
- ☐ A lot
- ☐ A moderate amount
- ☐ A little
- ☐ None at all

Next >>

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1

FOOD_TASTE

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

If you were to buy dog food, when deciding which food to buy, how much attention would you pay to whether or not the food **tastes good to dogs**? A great deal of attention, a lot of attention, a moderate amount of attention, a little attention, or none at all?

- ☐ A great deal
- ☐ A lot
- ☐ A moderate amount
- ☐ A little
- ☐ None at all

Next >>

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1

FOOD_HEALTH.

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

If you were to buy dog food, when deciding which food to buy, how much attention would you pay to whether or not the food will **improve the health of dogs**? A great deal of attention, a lot of attention, a moderate amount of attention, a little attention, or none at all?

☐ A great deal

☐ A lot

☐ A moderate amount

☐ A little

☐ None at all

Next >>

DISPLAY IF DOG_EVER = 1

FOOD_APPEARANCE

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

If you were to buy dog food, when deciding which food to buy, how much attention would you pay to whether or not the food will **improve the appearance of dogs**? A great deal of attention, a lot of attention, a moderate amount of attention, a little attention, or none at all?

☐ A great deal

☐ A lot

☐ A moderate amount

☐ A little

☐ None at all

Next >>

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM = 1

DOG_FOODSPEND

UnderstandingAmericaStudy

During the time when you have owned a dog, how much money did you spend for your dog's food per month, on average?

Please round to the nearest dollar and type the amount in the box below.

\$

.00

Next >>

DISPLAY IF DOG_NUM > 1

DOGS_FOODSPEND

UnderstandingAmericaStudy

During the time when you have owned dogs, how much money did you spend for your dogs' food per month, on average?

Please round to the nearest dollar and type the amount in the box below.

\$

.00

Next >>

Now we'd like to ask some questions about you.

P_SHOP_ORGANIC

UnderstandingAmericaStudy

Now we'd like to ask some questions about you.

When you shopped for groceries during the last month, did you ever buy **organic** products, or did you not do that?

- ☐ Did that
- ☐ Did not do that

Next >>

P_SHOP_NONGMO

UnderstandingAmericaStudy

When you shopped for groceries during the last month, did you ever buy **non-GMO** products, or do you not do that?

- ☐ Did that
- ☐ Did not do that

Next >>

UnderstandingAmericaStudy

Could you tell us how interesting or uninteresting you found the questions in this interview?

- ☐ Very interesting
- ☐ Interesting
- ☐ Neither interesting nor uninteresting
- ☐ Uninteresting
- ☐ Very uninteresting

Next >>

UnderStandingAmericaStudy

Do you have any other comments on the interview? Please type these in the box below (if you have no comments, please click next to complete this survey.)

Next >>



UnderStandingAmericaStudy

English

Welcome to the Understanding America Study

If you are a study participant, please enter your login number and password below.

Login number:

Password:

Login

If you do not remember your login number or password, contact the helpdesk at [1-855-872-8673](tel:1-855-872-8673) (9am - 5pm PST) or by email: uashelp@usc.edu.



Appendix C

USC CESR Field Report (including information about the panel)

Field Report for Understanding America Study Survey UAS168

AUGUST 2019

Tania Gutsche, Erik Meijer, Marco Angrisani, Bart Orriens, Bas Weerman

The Understanding America Study is a probability-based panel created and operated by the Center for Economic and Social Research out of the University of Southern California. Respondents are recruited by mail through USPS records. The study is an ‘Internet Panel,’ which means that respondents answer our surveys on a computer, tablet, or smart phone, wherever they are and whenever they wish to participate. Respondents are able to skip questions they are uncomfortable answering as well as decide whether or not to complete each survey offered to them.

Human Subjects Protection


The Understanding America Study is an ongoing study registered and approved by the University of Southern California’s institutional review board as study id UP-14-00148. This survey was approved under amendment UP-14-00148-AM066 on July 19, 2019. USC’s Federal Wide Assurance number is 00007099.

Sampling

The sample for this survey was selected following these steps. First, we identified the UAS members recruited within nationally representative batches who did not express a preference for surveys in Spanish. As of July 13, 2019, the total number of respondents satisfying these criteria was 5,253. Among these respondents, a random sample of 1,200 was selected and invited to take the survey. Specifically, we drew a random number from a uniform distribution, ranked eligible respondents by this number, and selected the first 1,200.

Survey incentives

Respondents in the Understanding America Study are paid \$20 for every 30 minutes of survey time. Rewards earned each month are deposited on a prepaid card the first week of the following month. Respondents can track their earned rewards by logging into their study pages, and are informed before they take each survey the approximate time it will take and the amount that will be earned for completion. Survey UAS168 was estimated to take 25 minutes and respondents earned \$17 for completion. Timing distribution is seen in the table below and includes incomplete surveys.



Construction of Panel Base Weights

All UAS surveys contain both base weights and final, post-stratification weights. For this particular survey, only base weights are provided. Base weights are generated to correct for unequal probabilities of sampling zip codes produced by the adaptive sampling algorithm, as well as to account for the probability of sampling households conditional on their zip code being sampled.

The UAS regularly recruits new batches of panel members. All respondents invited for this survey were sampled from the nationally representative batches, which were recruited using three different sampling methods. Batch 1 was a simple random sample from a national database that included 95% of the U.S. population. Batches 5-12 used an adaptive sampling algorithm, by which zip codes with population characteristics underrepresented in the UAS were sampled with a higher probability, and then 40 addresses were randomly drawn within the selected zip codes. Batch 17 used a similar algorithm, with the difference that the number of addresses within each zip code was drawn proportional to the number of households in the zip code. For computing base weights, these three sampling methods are treated as three sampling frames.

We estimate the (a priori) probability that a household was drawn in each sampling frame separately. The estimated probability that the household was drawn for the UAS is the sum of these three probabilities, and the base weight is the inverse of this, scaled to have a mean of 1 among all households drawn in these batches. For batch 1, the probability of being drawn is the number of households drawn divided by the number of households in the U.S. For the other two frames (batches 5-12 and 17), the probability of the household being drawn is the probability of the zip code being drawn times the conditional probability of the household being drawn if the zip code is drawn. In this case, we estimate the probability that a zip code is drawn via logit model as a function of the following zip code characteristics: Census region, urbanicity, population size, as well as sex, race, age, marital status, and education composition. Estimation is carried out on an American Community Survey (ACS) file that contains 5-year average characteristics at the ZIP Code Tabulation Area (ZCTA) level, with urbanicity derived from 2010 Urban Area to ZIP Code Tabulation Area Relationship File of the U.S. Census Bureau and merged to this. The probability that a household from a given zip code is drawn, conditional on that zip code being drawn, is computed differently for batches 5-12 and batch 17. Specifically, for batches 5-12 it is given by the number of drawn households in the zip code (40) divided by the total number of households in the zip code. For batch 17, since the number of sampled addresses is proportional to the zip code population with a target average of 40, the probability that a household from a given zip code is drawn, conditional on that zip code being

drawn, is the same for all zip codes. Thus, it can be computed dividing 40 by the average number of households per zip code. The probability that a household from batches 5-12 and 17 is drawn is obtained by multiplying the probability of drawing a zip code and the conditional probability of drawing a household within a selected zip code, as described above.

After computing the overall probability that a household is drawn in one of the three frames as the sum of the three separate probabilities (ignoring the negligible probability that a household is drawn multiple times, which we ensure is not the case), the raw base weight is the inverse of this probability. More details about the computation of the base weights can be found in Angrisani et al. (2019).³⁴

Response Rates and Survey Invitations

Response rates and attrition (%):

	Number	Percent ^a
Sampled addresses	43,474	
Nonresidential/vacant	5,656	
Valid addresses (upper bound)	37,818	
Completed mail survey	15,051	39.8
Consented to participate	11,022	73.2
Became panel member	6,017	54.6
Active (retention)	4,364	72.5
Invited for survey	1,200	
Completed survey	859	71.6
Cumulative response rate		8.3

^aConditional on the previous line

INVITATIONS

Survey invitations were sent through the sample management system which included the following text:

Subject: New UAS168 survey ready

Dear First Name,

I'm writing to let you know that new survey UAS168 is now open for you at our site.

This survey asks you to read information and answer some questions about a consumer product. It should take no more than 25 minutes, and you will be compensated \$17 for completion.

³⁴ Angrisani, M., Kapteyn, A., Meijer, E., & Saw, H.-W. (2019). *Sampling and weighting the Understanding America Study*. Los Angeles, CA: University of Southern California, Center for Economic and Social Research. (In preparation)

To begin, first go to the Understanding America Study secure website: <https://uas.usc.edu>
(If this link is disabled by your browser, please copy and paste it instead of clicking on it)
Your Login Number: xxxxxxxx
Your Password: yyyyyy

Thank you so much for participating in our study!

Tania Gutsche

Study Manager <https://uas.usc.edu> 855.872.8673

Reminder:

Subject: New UAS168 survey is still ready for you

Dear First Name,

I'm writing to let you know that new survey UAS168 is still ready for you at our site.

This survey asks you to read information and answer some questions about a consumer product. It should take no more than 25 minutes, and you will be compensated \$17 for completion.

To begin, first go to the Understanding America Study secure website: <https://uas.usc.edu>
(If this link is disabled by your browser, please copy and paste it instead of clicking on it)
Your Login Number: xxxxxxxx
Your Password: yyyyyy

Thank you so much for participating in our study!

Tania Gutsche

Study Manager <https://uas.usc.edu> 855.872.8673

Survey invitations and reminders were sent on the following Schedule:

Date Sent	Invitations
Thursday 7/25/19	1099 emails sent
Thursday 7/25/19	89 postcards sent
Saturday 7/27/19	682 emails sent
Friday 8/2/19	483 emails sent
Monday 8/5/19	411 emails sent

Appendix D

Sample Characteristics and Weighting

Draft report as of 8/5/19 while survey is still in the field. As a result survey results and response rate are not final.

Benchmarking

Benchmarks for this study were drawn from three large federal surveys of the American population: the March 2019 Current Population Survey (CPS), the March 2018 Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC) of the CPS, and the 2018 National Health Interview Survey (NHIS). The goal when drawing benchmarks from these samples, as for any benchmarking exercise, is to simultaneously maximize the accuracy of the method used to generate the benchmarking sample and to draw data from the most recent possible study. These datasets are the most commonly used benchmarking studies because they draw large samples of Americans, use gold standard survey methods, are collected on a regular basis, and have extraordinarily high response rates.

Current Population Survey (CPS)

OVERVIEW

The CPS is a monthly survey of households that provides data on employment and demographic characteristics of household members. The CPS uses rotating samples of households. Randomly selected housing units are surveyed every month for four months, are not surveyed for the next eight months, and then are surveyed again every month for four months. Housing units are weighted to account for probability of selection and unit non-response. Each household member is weighted to account for: (1) probability of household selection; (2) unit non-response; (3) deviations from known population distributions of demographic characteristics.

Demographic and labor force data are collected during the monthly CPS interviews. One knowledgeable adult in a household (called the household informant) provides information about the age, sex, marital status, educational attainment, race, ethnicity, veteran and current armed

forces statuses, citizenship status, and relationship to the person who owns or rents the home for all people who usually live in the housing unit. Although CPS interviewers attempt to obtain labor force data from each household member, data for approximately half of these members are provided by proxies.

Some CPS interviews are conducted face-to-face, and others are conducted via telephone. Unless the household informant specifically requests a telephone interview, every informant for a household that has not previously completed a CPS interview participates in a face-to-face interview.

CPS MARCH 2019 BASIC SURVEY

The March 2019 CPS basic survey included a demographics questionnaire, a labor force questionnaire, and the ASEC.³⁵ Informants in households participating in a CPS interview for the first time answered questions in the demographics questionnaire about the age, sex, marital status, educational attainment, race, ethnicity, veteran and current armed forces statuses, citizenship status, and relationship to the person who owns or rents the home for all people who usually live in the housing unit. Informants in households that previously participated in a CPS interview answered questions about any changes to the people living in the household. Household members or household informants completing the labor force questionnaire answered questions about work-related activities during a target week. Household members or household informants completing the ASEC questionnaire answered questions about work experience, income, noncash benefits, and migration.

³⁵ The 2019 ASEC is not yet publicly available.

A total of 48,697 households completed interviews during the March 2019 CPS survey. Of the 38,028 households for which type of interview data were available, 40.2% completed face-to-face interviews and 59.8% completed telephone interviews.

MARCH 2019 DATA USED FOR ADDITIONAL BENCHMARKS

Household size benchmarks are derived from information provided by household informants when developing the household roster. Household informants answer questions about the people residing in, and relations among the people residing in, the household. Answers to these questions are used to identify the number of individuals living in the participating household, which the CPS defines as:

A household consists of all the persons who occupy a house, an apartment, or other group of rooms, or a room, which constitutes a housing unit. A group of rooms or a single room is regarded as a housing unit when it is occupied as separate living quarters; that is, when the occupants do not live with any other person in the structure, and when there is direct access from the outside or through a common hall. The count of households excludes persons living in group quarters, such as military barracks and institutions. Inmates of institutions (mental hospitals, rest homes, correctional institutions, etc.) are not included in the survey.³⁶

The following questions are used to build the roster:

(What are the names of all persons living or staying here? / What is the name of the next person)?

Is this (name of person talking about)'s usual place of residence?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Proxy

³⁶ Current Population Survey (2017). 2017 Annual Social and Economic (ASEC) Supplement. Available at: <https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/techdocs/>.

Does (name of person talking about) have a usual place of residence elsewhere?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

Are there any other persons 15 years old or older now living or staying there? (Who have not been listed.)

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

How many other?

I have listed . . . READ NAMES. Have I missed any babies or small children?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

Have I missed anyone who usually lives here but is away now -traveling, at school, or in a hospital?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

Have I missed any lodgers, boarders, or persons you employ who live here?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

Have I missed anyone else staying here?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

What is the name of the person or one of the persons who owns or rents that home?

How (are / is) (name/you) related to (reference person's name/you)?

- 42. Opposite-sex Spouse (Husband/Wife)
- 43. Opposite-sex Unmarried Partner
- 44. Same-sex Spouse (Husband/Wife)
- 45. Same-sex Unmarried Partner
- 46. Child
- 47. Grandchild
- 48. Parent (Mother/Father)
- 49. Brother/Sister

- 50. Other relative (Aunt, Cousin, Nephew, Mother-in-law, etc.)
- 51. Foster_Child
- 52. Housemate/Roommate
- 53. Roomer/Boarder
- 54. Other nonrelative

Earlier you said that (name of person talking about) (was/were) not related to (reference person's name/you). (Are / Is) (name of person talking about) related to anyone else in this household?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

Who (are / is) (name of person talking about) related to?
PROBE: Anyone else?

Ask if necessary: Is (name's/your) parent a member of this household?

(Are / Is) (name of person talking about) (your / mother's name) biological, step, or adopted child?

- 1. Biological
- 2. Step
- 3. Adopted

Ask if necessary: Is (name's/your) other parent a member of this household?

(Are / Is) (name of person talking about) (your / father's name) biological, step, or adopted child?

- 1. Biological
- 2. Step
- 3. Adopted

(REF_FNAME ^REF_LNAME's) parent is also (name of person talking about)'s parent, is that correct?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

To produce the benchmarks, the following variables were extracted from the March 2019 CPS Public Use Microdata file. The benchmarks were extracted after excluding records for persons less than 18 years of age, and weighting records for persons 18 years old or older using

the post-stratification weights (PWSSWGT-FINAL WEIGHT) included in the public use data file. Coding is noted in brackets if recodes were done.

Household-Level Variables

Region (4-level)
GEREG (REGION)

- | | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| 1 | Northeast |
| 2 | Midwest (Formerly North Central) |
| 3 | South |
| 4 | West |

Metropolitan Status
GTMETSTA (METROPOLITAN STATUS)

- | | |
|---|------------------|
| 1 | Metropolitan |
| 2 | Non-metropolitan |
| 3 | Not identified |

Total family income
HEFAMINC

- | | |
|----|--|
| 1 | Less than \$5,000 [<i>Less than \$35,000</i>] |
| 2 | \$5,000 to \$7,499 [<i>Less than \$35,000</i>] |
| 3 | \$7,500 to \$9,999 [<i>Less than \$35,000</i>] |
| 4 | \$10,000 to \$12,499 [<i>Less than \$35,000</i>] |
| 5 | \$12,500 to \$14,999 [<i>Less than \$35,000</i>] |
| 6 | \$15,000 to \$19,999 [<i>Less than \$35,000</i>] |
| 7 | \$20,000 to \$24,999 [<i>Less than \$35,000</i>] |
| 8 | \$25,000 to \$29,999 [<i>Less than \$35,000</i>] |
| 9 | \$30,000 to \$34,999 [<i>Less than \$35,000</i>] |
| 10 | \$35,000 to \$39,999 [<i>\$35,000 to \$49,999</i>] |
| 11 | \$40,000 to \$49,999 [<i>\$35,000 to \$49,999</i>] |
| 12 | \$50,000 to \$59,999 [<i>\$50,000 to \$74,999</i>] |
| 13 | \$60,000 to \$74,999 [<i>\$50,000 to \$74,999</i>] |
| 14 | \$75,000 to \$99,999 [<i>\$75,000 to \$99,999</i>] |
| 15 | \$100,000 to \$149,999 [<i>\$100,000 or more</i>] |
| 16 | \$150,000 or more [<i>\$100,000 or more</i>] |

[This variable was recoded into 5 categories: Less than \$35,000, \$35,000 to \$49,999, \$50,000 to \$74,999, \$75,000 to \$99,999, and \$100,000 or more]

Household size including children

HRNUMHOU (Total number of persons living in the household)

[This variable was recoded into 4 categories: One person, Two persons, Three or four persons, Five or more persons]

Person-Level Variables

Sex

PESEX

- 1 Male
- 2 Female

Age

PRTAGE

- 00-79 0-79 Years of age
- 80 80-84 Years of age
- 81 85+ Years of age

[This variable was recoded into 5 categories: 18-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-64, and 65+.]

Educational attainment

PEEDUCA

- 31 Less than 1st grade *[Less than high school]*
- 32 1st,2nd,3rd,or 4th grade *[Less than high school]*
- 33 5th or 6th grade *[Less than high school]*
- 34 7th and 8th grade *[Less than high school]*
- 35 9th grade *[Less than high school]*
- 36 10th grade *[Less than high school]*
- 37 11th grade *[Less than high school]*
- 38 12th grade no diploma *[Less than high school]*
- 39 High school graduate – high school diploma or equivalent *[High school graduate or equivalent]*
- 40 Some college but no degree *[Some college but no bachelor's degree]*
- 41 Associate degree in college - occupation/vocation program *[Some college but no bachelor's degree]*
- 42 Associate degree in college - academic program *[Some college but no bachelor's degree]*
- 43 Bachelor's degree (for example: BA,AB,BS) *[Bachelor's degree]*

- 44 Master's degree (for example: MA,MS,MENG,MED,MSW, MBA) *[Advanced degree]*
- 45 Professional school degree (for example: MD,DDS,DVM,LLB,JD) *[Advanced degree]*
- 46 Doctorate degree (for example: PHD,EDD) *[Advanced degree]*

[This variable was recoded into 5 categories: Less than high school, High school graduate or equivalent, Some college but no bachelor's degree, Bachelor's degree, Advanced degree]

Race

PTDTRACE

- 01 White only *[White only]*
- 02 Black only *[Black only]*
- 03 American Indian, Alaskan Native only (AI) *[Other or multi-race]*
- 04 Asian only *[Other or multi-race]*
- 05 Hawaiian/Pacific Islander only (HP) *[Other or multi-race]*
- 06 White-Black *[Other or multi-race]*
- 07 White-AI *[Other or multi-race]*
- 08 White-Asian *[Other or multi-race]*
- 09 White-HP *[Other or multi-race]*
- 10 Black-AI *[Other or multi-race]*
- 11 Black-Asian *[Other or multi-race]*
- 12 Black-HP *[Other or multi-race]*
- 13 AI-Asian *[Other or multi-race]*
- 14 AI-HP *[Other or multi-race]*
- 15 Asian-HP *[Other or multi-race]*
- 16 White-Black-AI *[Other or multi-race]*
- 17 White-Black-Asian *[Other or multi-race]*
- 18 White-Black-HP *[Other or multi-race]*
- 19 White-AI-Asian *[Other or multi-race]*
- 20 White-AI-HP *[Other or multi-race]*
- 21 White-Asian-HP *[Other or multi-race]*
- 22 Black-AI-Asian *[Other or multi-race]*
- 23 White-Black-AI-Asian *[Other or multi-race]*
- 24 White-AI-Asian-HP *[Other or multi-race]*
- 25 Other 3 race comb *[Other or multi-race]*
- 26 Other 4 or 5 race comb *[Other or multi-race]*

[This variable was recoded into 3 categories: White only, Black only, Other or multi-race]

Hispanic

PEHSPNON

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

Employment Status

PEMLR

- 1 Employed – at work [*Employed*]
- 2 Employed – absent [*Employed*]
- 3 Unemployed - on layoff [*Unemployed – on layoff*]
- 4 Unemployed – looking [*Unemployed – looking*]
- 5 Not in labor force – retired [*Retired*]
- 6 Not in labor force – disabled [*Disabled*]
- 7 Not in labor force – other [*Other*]

[This variable was recoded into 3 categories: Employed, Not employed and not retired, Retired]

Marital Status

PEMARITL

- 1 Married – civilian spouse [*Married*]
- 2 Married – AF spouse present [*Married*]
- 3 Married – spouse absent (exc. Separated) [*Married*]
- 4 Widowed
- 5 Divorced
- 6 Separated
- 7 Never married

[This variable was recoded into 3 categories: Married, Widowed/divorced/separated, and Never married]

Citizenship

PRCITSHP

- 1 Native, Born in the United States [*U.S. citizen*]
- 2 Native, Born in Puerto Rico or other US island areas [*U.S. citizen*]
- 3 Native, Born abroad of American parent or parents [*U.S. citizen*]
- 4 Foreign born, US citizen by naturalization [*U.S. citizen*]
- 5 Foreign born, Not a citizen of the US [*Not a U.S. citizen*]

[This variable was recoded into 2 categories: U.S. citizen and Not a U.S. citizen]

Ever serve on active duty

PEAFEVER

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

Type of housing unit

HEHOUSUT

- 0 Other unit *[Other]*
- 1 House, apartment, flat *[House, apartment, flat]*
- 2 Hu in nontransient hotel, motel, etc. *[Other]*
- 3 Hu permanent in transient hotel, motel *[Other]*
- 4 Hu in rooming house *[Other]*
- 5 Mobile home or trailer w/no perm. Room added *[Other]*
- 6 Mobile home or trailer w/1 or more perm. Rooms added *[Other]*
- 7 Hu not specified above *[Other]*
- 8 Quarters not hu in rooming or brding hs *[Other]*
- 9 Unit not perm. In transient hotl, motl *[Other]*
- 10 Unoccupied tent site or trlr site *[Other]*
- 11 Student quarters in college dorm *[Other]*
- 12 Other unit not specified above *[Other]*

[This variable was recoded into 2 categories: House/apartment/flat and Other]

CPS MARCH 2018 ASEC QUESTIONNAIRE

Household members or household informants completing the 2018 ASEC supplement of the CPS answered questions about housing tenure, work experience, income, noncash benefits, and migration. The 2018 CPS ASEC data indicate that 75,356 of the 92,139 (81.8%) households selected for the survey provided housing tenure information.

The CPS ASEC Public Use Microdata file uses three different, nested units of observation. Data from the study are recorded at the household level, the family level, and the person level for all individuals in each household. Because weighting is designed to yield a collection of persons who are nationally representative, it is necessary to translate household-level variables to the person level. Also, because the data for most surveys is designed to represent the adult (18 and older) population, it is important to exclude children from all estimates. To accomplish this, metrics at the household level were appended to the person-level file for all persons 18 and older, and all persons were weighted using the post-stratification weight (MARSUPWT) included in the Public Use Microdata file.

To produce the housing tenure benchmarks, the following variable was extracted from the March 2018 CPS ASEC Public Use Microdata file:

Housing tenure

H_TENURE

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1 | Owned or being bought by a household member |
| 2 | Rented for cash |
| 3 | Occupied without payment of cash rent |

National Health Interview Survey (NHIS)

The NHIS is an annual cross-sectional household interview survey of the civilian noninstitutionalized United States population. Persons in long-term care institutions, correctional facilities, and U.S. nationals living in foreign countries are excluded from the survey. Households and non-institutional group quarters (e.g., college dormitories) are randomly sampled following a multi-stage area probability design that results in samples of units from every state and the District of Columbia. The NHIS is the principal source of information on the health of the civilian non-institutionalized population of the United States and is one of the major data collection programs of the National Center for Health Statistics.

Interviews are conducted for the NHIS conducts throughout the year. Randomly sampled households receive a mailed letter explaining the purpose of the NHIS and providing general information about NHIS interviews. The NHIS uses field interviewers to conduct in-person interviews of members of randomly sampled households. One household member who is at least the age of legal majority for the state of residence is identified as the “household respondent”, and the household respondent completes the Household Composition section of the questionnaire. One resident family member who is at least the age of legal majority is identified as the “family respondent”, and the family respondent completes a Family Core questionnaire on behalf of all family members living in the household. While NHIS field interviewers conduct other interviews with randomly selected household members, the benchmarks estimated from 2018 NHIS data came only from the family core questionnaire.

The 2018 NHIS public use microdata files contained information for 30,309 families containing 72,831 persons in 29,839 households. The NHIS reports the family level response rate for the 2018 NHIS, which reflects the number of families providing sufficient family level data

in randomly selected and eligible households, at 64.2%. Of the randomly selected and eligible households, 35.8% refused to participate or failed to sufficiently complete an interview. Most of the remaining non-interviews were the result of failures to locate a household respondent after repeated contact attempts.³⁷

Similar to the CPS ASEC Public Use Microdata file, the NHIS data are recorded at the family level and the person level for all individuals in each household. IN order to generate benchmarks at the person level, measures from the family data file were appended to the person-level file for all persons 18 and older, and all persons were weighted using the post-stratification weight (WTFA) included in the Public Use Microdata file. The WTFA weights account for: (1) probability of household selection; (2) known population distributions of demographic characteristics.

Answers to two questions in the 2018 NHIS Family Core questionnaire were used to estimate the “telephones” benchmarks. One question identified families with non-cell phone telephones in their households and the other identified families with cell phones. The question wordings and response options to these questions are:

Landline service (CURWRK)

Is there at least one telephone INSIDE your home that is currently working and is not a cell phone?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 7 Refused
- 9 Don't know

Cell phone service (TELCEL)

Do you or anyone in your family have a working cell phone?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

³⁷ Center for Disease Control and Prevention (June, 2019). National Health Interview Survey (NHIS): Public use data release. Available at: <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhis/data-questionnaires-documentation.htm>.

- 7 Refused
- 9 Don't know

The “Telephone” benchmarks were estimated by categorizing all family members for whom CURWRK=1 and TELCEL≠1 as “Landline telephone only”, all family members for whom CURWRK≠1 and TELCEL=1 as “Cellphone only”, and all family members for whom CURWRK=1 and TELCEL=1 as “Landline and cell phone”. Family members with either “Refused”, “Not ascertained”, or “Don’t know” for both CURWRK and TELCEL were treated as “missing” and excluded from the benchmark computation.

TABLE 1. March, 2019, Benchmarks (unless otherwise noted, benchmarks are from the March 2019 CPS basic survey).

Variable	Category	March 2019 Benchmarks
Sex	Male	48.27%
	Female	51.73%
	Total	100.00%
Age	18-29 years old	20.80%
	30-39 years old	17.27%
	40-49 years old	15.92%
	50-64 years old	25.06%
	65 years old or older	20.95%
	Total	100.00%
Race	White only	77.72%
	Black only	12.65%
	Other/multirace	9.63%
	Total	100.00%
Hispanic	Hispanic	16.49%
	Not Hispanic	83.51%
	Total	100.00%
Education	Less than HS	10.66%
	HS grad	28.28%
	Some college	27.74%
	College grad	21.32%
	Post-grad	12.00%
	Total	100.00%
Employment status	Employed	62.14%
	Not employed	19.02%
	Retired	18.84%
	Total	100.00%
Marital status	Married	52.72%
	Widowed, Divorced, Separated	18.54%
	Never married	28.74%
	Total	100.00%
Citizenship	U.S. citizen	91.41%

	Not a U.S. citizen	8.59%
	Total	100.00%
Ever serve on active duty	Yes	7.34%
	No	92.66%
	Total	100.00%
Census region	Northeast	17.55%
	Midwest	20.78%
	South	37.90%
	West	23.77%
	Total	100.00%
Metropolitan status	Metropolitan	86.72%
	Non-metropolitan	12.53%
	Not identified	.76%
	Total	100.00%
Family income	Less than \$35,000	26.38%
	\$35,000 - \$49,999	13.02%
	\$50,000 - \$74,999	18.43%
	\$75,000 - \$99,999	13.51%
	\$100,000 or more	28.65%
	Total	100.00%
Persons living in household	One person	14.81%
	Two persons	34.91%
	Three or four persons	35.46%
	Five or more persons	14.82%
	Total	100.00%
Housing tenure (ASEC 2018)	Owned or being bought	67.97%
	Rented for cash	30.90%
	Occupied without payment of cash rent	1.13%
Type of housing unit	House, apartment, flat	95.66%
	Other	4.34%
	Total	100.00%
Telephones (NHIS 2018)	Landline only	4.3%
	Landline and cell phone	37.7%
	Cell phone only	57.9%

Weighting Procedure

To develop weights for the USC CESR data, we followed the basic procedure outlined by a Blue-Ribbon panel convened by the American National Election Studies to generate their weighting procedure.³⁸ This weighting process involves (1) identifying a series of benchmarks for weighting, (2) correcting for known deviations from simple random sampling in the design by using a base weight, (3) running a raking (a.k.a. rim weighting or iterative proportional fitting) model to produce weights that lead the overall dataset to match the benchmarks that are most discrepant from those in the sample and (4) trimming any very large weights that emerge in the process. The approach proposed by panel members is implemented in the `ipfweight` command in the STATA software package, which conducts many of the steps recommended by the Blue-Ribbon Panel in an automated manner, ensuring that arbitrary researcher decisions are not influencing the eventual results. The `ipfweight` was specified using an option that trimmed the weights so a maximum value of 5.

To produce the weights used for this study, twelve benchmark categories were considered: sex, Census region, metropolitan status, marital status, persons in household, age categories, educational attainment, home ownership, race/ethnicity, working status, housing type, and home internet access. The NHIS benchmarks for combining mobile phones and landlines were not used for this study for two reasons. First, the sampling procedure used for USC CESR panel did not rely heavily on telephone interviewing, meaning that there was not a strong theoretical reason to expect that telephone status would matter for response propensities. Second, this variable was not available for USC CESR panel members

³⁸ <https://www.electionstudies.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/nes012427.pdf>

Whenever benchmarking categories included fewer than 5% of the U.S. population or when there were more than 6 categories for a benchmarking variable, we attempted to combine that category with the most closely related categories until this was no longer an issue. When there were multiple equally acceptable combinations of response categories that could be used, we opted to combine smaller categories first to maximize the proportion of respondents across each of the benchmarking groups used.

For most other variables, selections of six or fewer categories to use were made based on the fewest category classifications that were available. Hence, benchmarks were created for the four-category age and education variables that were provided as standard demographics by USC CESR.

Finally, for variables where a single category was especially frequent relative to the others, we created dichotomous benchmarks placing respondents either in the modal category or not. These included metropolitan status (86.72% of the population), home ownership (69.97% of the population owns their homes), and housing type (95.66% live in a house, apartment or flat).